



# Influencing Health Behaviors via Short Message Service (SMS): Evidence for Best Practices From Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania and Xi'an China

## Citation

Heitner, Jesse. 2016. Influencing Health Behaviors via Short Message Service (SMS): Evidence for Best Practices From Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania and Xi'an China. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health.

## Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:27201737>

## Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.  
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

**INFLUENCING HEALTH BEHAVIORS VIA SHORT MESSAGE SERVICE (SMS):  
EVIDENCE FOR BEST PRACTICES FROM DAR ES SALAAM, TANZANIA AND  
XI'AN CHINA**

JESSE HEITNER

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of  
The Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Doctor of Science  
in the Department of Global Health and Population  
Harvard University  
Boston, Massachusetts.

May 2016

**INFLUENCING HEALTH BEHAVIORS VIA SHORT MESSAGE SERVICE (SMS):  
EVIDENCE FOR BEST PRACTICES FROM DAR ES SALAAM, TANZANIA AND  
XI'AN, CHINA**

**Abstract**

Text messaging, also known as short message services (SMS), is a burgeoning innovation area showing promise in eliciting health behavior changes. This dissertation details two intervention trials that each comparatively tests the efficacy of different text message sets intended to improve behaviors.

In light of pervasive road traffic injuries amongst young men in Tanzania, the first intervention tested messaging strategies aimed at increasing helmet wearing amongst commercial motorcycle taxi drivers. Participants (N=391) were randomized to receive either: 1) social norming messages emphasizing society's positive stance on helmets; 2) fear appeal messages emphasizing the dangers of riding without helmets, or 3) control messages. After 6-weeks, the odds of drivers reporting wearing their helmet "on every trip" was 1.58 times higher in the social norming group than amongst controls, though this difference was not significant after accounting for multiple hypothesis testing. There was little difference between fear appeal recipients and controls.

In light of China's excessive caesarean section rate of up to 54.9%, the second trial tested messaging strategies aimed at reducing unnecessary caesareans. This quasi-randomized trial assigned pregnant women (N= 4,375) to receive one of four message sets: 1) Limited "Basic" messages, 2) A set primarily regarding Care-Seeking, 3) A set primarily regarding good prenatal Home Practices, or 4) All Texts. Amongst women that acknowledged receiving program texts,

care-seeking messages alone were associated with reduced odds of caesarean delivery (OR=0.71,  $p=.045$ ). Assignment to receive All Texts was associated with strongly reduced odds (OR = 0.65,  $p=0.008$ ).

Last, an observational study utilizing the Xi'an data investigated the association newborns being born small for gestational age (SGA) and women's levels of family support. Adjusted logistic regression found that high support was associated with reduced odds of SGA (OR =0.681  $p=.013$ ). Mediation analysis suggested this association was at least partially mediated by better nutrition supplementation and more moderate exercise.

These results suggest SMS interventions may be useful tools in eliciting behavior change surrounding helmet wearing and mode of delivery. Some message types may outperform others, and family support may be a useful leverage point. Further investigation is warranted.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables .....	v
Acknowledgments .....	vi
Chapter I: Background and motivation for SMS interventions to improve healthy behavior in developing country contexts.....	1
Chapter II: The Impact Of Text Message (SMS) Reminders on Helmet Use Among Motorcycle Drivers In Dar es Salaam, Tanzania .....	16
Appendix 2.1: SMS Message Bank .....	31
Chapter III: The Effect on Cesarean Section Rates of an SMS Based Educational Intervention for Pregnant Women in Xi'an China .....	42
Appendix 3.1: SMS Messages, by General Topic, Treatment Group, and Timing .....	80
Appendix 3.2: Messages Regarding Delivery Advice by Treatment Arm.....	81
Chapter IV: The Association of Familial Support with Birth Weight and Prenatal Behaviors In A Cohort from Xi'an China.....	86
Appendix 4.1: Formulation and Implementation of Mikolajczyk et al.'s SGA Cutoff .....	125
Appendix 4.2: Range and N of All Regression Variables.....	127

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Published SMS Interventions for Behavior Change from Literature Review .....	8
Table 2.1: Balance Check for All Observed Baseline Variables.....	24
Table 2.2: Percentage of Drivers Reporting Helmet Use Every Trip (All Time Points) .....	27
Table 2.3: Percent of Drivers Reporting Helmet Use Every Trip at 6 Weeks, by Baseline Behavior.....	28
Table 2.4: Pairwise Treatment Group Comparisons of Odds of Consistent Helmet Wearing (Using Coefficient Results of <i>Unadjusted</i> Logistic Regression.....	30
Table 2.5: Pairwise Treatment Group Comparisons of Odds of Consistent Helmet Wearing (Using Coefficient Results of <i>Adjusted</i> Logistic Regression.....	32
Table 3.1A: Balance Check, All Baseline Variables, All Enrollees.....	56
Table 3.1A: Balance Check, All Baseline Variables, Women With Follow-up Surveys.....	60
Table 3.2: Birth Method Rates By Treatment Assignment .....	66
Table 3.3: Unadjusted Logistic Regression of Caesarean Birth on Treatment Assignment.....	68
Table 3.3: Covariate-Adjusted Logistic Regression of Caesarean Birth on Treatment Group...	70
Table 4.1A Selected Dichotomous Follow-Up Variables, Pre-Imputation .....	107
Table 4.1B Exercise Frequency at Follow-Up, Pre-Imputation .....	107
Table 4.2: Adjusted and Unadjusted Odds Ratios of SGA with High Family Support .....	108
Table 4.3 Full Model Results of Logistic Regression of SGA on High Family Support .....	109
Table 4.4: Unadjusted Logistic Regressions: Prenatal Behaviors on High Family Support ....	113
Table 4.5: Adjusted Logistic Regressions: Prenatal Behaviors on High Family Support .....	114

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the following, to whom I give deep and sincere thanks:

My dissertation committee members, Dr. David Canning, Dr. Margaret McConnell, and Dr. Till Barnighausen, whose advice and guidance made this research much more solid.

Dr. Yanfang Su, who reached out to me, gave me opportunity, and entrusted me with a great deal of responsibility.

The EMI Team, whose collaborative efforts made this research possible. Special thanks to Ben Campbell, Changzheng Yuan, Zhongliang Zhou, and Dan Wang.

The Sumner L. Felberg Fellowship, for financial support during my studies.

Barbara Heil, who, simply put, is invaluable.

My fellow cohort Members, Susan, Stacy, Mathieu, Mitchell, and Andrea, for great company along the way.

Tura Linderholm, for good advice.

My family, whose contributions cannot begin to be listed in this space.

## CHAPTER I

### **Background and motivation for SMS interventions to improve healthy behavior in developing country contexts**

The use of text messages, also known as short message services (SMS), in public health and clinical settings has recently received the attention of several systematic reviews, as has mobile health (mHealth) more generally. This dissertation will report the findings of two new SMS intervention trials both designed to test the efficacy of SMS interventions for improving health behaviors in low and middle-income settings as well as to test the comparative efficacy of different styles of text messages. The first trial is a randomized controlled trial in Dar Es Salam, Tanzania investigating the use of SMS to potentially increase the wearing of motorcycle helmets amongst motorcycle taxi drivers in the city. The second is a quasi-randomized control trial in Xi'an China investigating the use of SMS to promote various healthier behaviors amongst pregnant women in Gaoling County, and in particular for this dissertation the reduction of unnecessary elective cesarean section deliveries. This dissertation will also use the same data from Xi'an to explore predictors and motivators of healthy behavior more generally in a subsequent chapter.

Most major health behavior theories (such as the Health Belief Model, Social Cognitive Theory, the Theory of Planned Behavior, The Theory of Reasoned Action, and the Transtheoretical Model) make no specific reference the potential of SMS technology, and often predate widespread SMS usage. In this study, SMS technology is seen as a vehicle for behavioral interventions, rather than an intervention of itself. Understanding and predicting in what contexts certain content may be effective and why, however, has a great deal of relation to behavioral theory. This dissertation does not attempt to discern which of the many behavioral



theories are most predictive in our study contexts, nor review the extensive field of health behavior theory in any breadth. Rather, it aims to test what specific message content and social factors are associated with the best behaviors and outcomes in our study contexts. Readers wishing to connect the experimental and observational findings of this dissertation to behavioral theory to theorize how the findings contained best fit within or inform behavioral theory are referred to (Lippke and Ziegelmann, 2008; Noar and Zimmerman, 2005) as primers.

This chapter will discuss the current state of the evidence regarding the use of SMS interventions for public health, with a particular spotlight on SMS interventions for maternal and child health. It will show that that SMS interventions are a promising area of exploration for health promotion, but more and better powered studies than have been done previously are warranted before coming to any sweeping conclusions regarding their efficacy.

Chapter II will discuss findings of a randomized controlled trial was conducted in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, in which 391 motorcycle taxi drivers were randomized to either a control group, or to a group receiving one of two different types of helmet wearing promotion messages. The first group received social norming messages aimed at emphasizing society's positive stance on helmet wearing; the second received fear appeal messages that emphasized the dangers of riding without a helmet. The primary outcome is the percent of respondents in each group self-reporting that they consistently wore their motorcycle helmet on every trip over the previous week at the study's end-line. According to the Global Burden of Disease 2010 Study, road traffic injuries are the second leading cause of Disability-Adjusted Life Years form men aged 15-24 in Tanzania (Murray et al., 2013). Adherence to helmet use as remained dangerously low despite tighter

helmet wearing laws (Chalya et al., 2013; United Republic of Tanzania, 2009). The purpose of this study was to comparatively determine which sorts of messages motorcyclists in Dar es Salaam would find most motivating for increased helmet wearing in future campaigns to promote helmet usage.

Chapter III will discuss the effect of an SMS based educational intervention for 1,952 pregnant women in Gaoling County in Xi'an, China. China has an extremely high caesarean section delivery rate, potentially up to 54.9% (Liu et al., 2014). The purpose of this study is to evaluate the impact of different informational text messages (SMS) informational messages regarding prenatal health and delivery mode on rates of caesarean section delivery in the study population, in order to inform future interventions targeted at lowering caesarean delivery rates on the most important messages that influence women to deliver vaginally. Participants were assigned into one of four groups, each receiving a different set of messages, including 1) a comparison group that received only a few "basic" messages, 2) a group receiving messages primarily regarding care-seeking, 3) a group receiving messages primarily regarding good home prenatal practices, and 4) a group receiving all text messages. The "Basic" message group was sent no messages regarding mode of delivery. The "Care Seeking" message group was sent seven relevant messages, generally focusing on describing proper indications for caesarean, and cautions regarding risks of caesareans. The "Home Practices" group received fifteen relevant messages, generally focusing on inspiring confidence in vaginal delivery and discussing non-anesthetic ways to reduce and cope with pain during delivery. The "All Texts" group was sent all texts in both other intervention groups.

Finally, Chapter IV will discuss the association of Familial Support on Prenatal Behaviors and Small for Gestational age in the same cohort of 1,952 women in Xi'an China described in Chapter III. This chapter does not assess the effect of the SMS intervention as the previous chapter does, but rather assess if social support from a woman's family is associated with better birth outcomes as measured by small for gestational age. Further, the study investigates whether such an association might be mediated through an association with better health behaviors, and if so, which ones. In 2015, China had 16.55 Million new births (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2016). With the recent relaxations in China's one child policy, this number could grow considerably in the next few years. Understanding the current influences of newborn health in China, particularly as influenced by modifiable health behaviors, could potentially benefit millions of new parents and health practitioners during years that could see a baby boom within the country.

### **Background SMS for Maternal and Child Health**

Only two review papers have focused specifically on the use of mHealth for maternal and newborn health. A 2011 review paper by Noordam and colleagues evaluated the use of mHealth specifically within the context of Low and Middle Income Countries (LMIC). A main finding of the paper was that "Robust studies providing evidence on the impact of introducing mobile phones to improve the quality or increase the use of maternal health services are lacking." (Noordam et al., 2011). Another 2011 review by Tamrat and Kachnowski took a broader scope and reviewed mHealth programs for both maternal and newborn health around the world. The authors concluded that "mHealth presents a new and pervasive platform for addressing prenatal

and newborn health,” but also pointed out that a “relative scarcity of articles with a quantitative design challenged the ability to statistically corroborate the impact of mHealth.” (Tamrat and Kachnowski, 2012). Evidence from the studies in these reviews and more recent publications indicate that though it seems promising that mHealth interventions can help mothers feel more prepared, evidence on actual health behaviors or health outcomes is unclear, and larger-scale evaluations seem warranted (Evans et al., 2012; Jareethum et al., 2008; Lund et al., 2012; Naughton et al., 2012). However, despite this scarcity of maternal and child health specific evidence, much more can be posited about the use potential uses of mHealth for maternal and child health than these limited findings would suggest. Substantial literature suggests that the use of text messages can be an effective intervention for generating several types of behavior change in recipients, as detailed below. Particularly studied are clinic attendance and vaccination rates, but other behavioral studies have also showed good promise.

### **SMS for Clinic Attendance**

One well-studied area is the effect of SMS appointment reminders on on-time clinic attendance. Guy and colleagues recently conducted a systematic review of the effect of SMS reminders on clinic attendance that covered studies published by June 2010. Meta-analysis concluded that there was significant heterogeneity of effect size by study design (RTCs vs. observational studies), though not by clinic type, message timing, or age of target group. The summary measure from the RTCs was an odds ratio of attendance of 1.48 (1.23-1.72). These findings echo a broader 2011 review by Hasvold and Wootton that covered SMS, phone, and automated phone calls. All studies except one (the same as in Guy and colleague’s review) suggested a positive

effect, with an average reduction of 34% in clinic *non*-attendance (Hasvold and Wootton, 2011). In one study too recent to be included in either review, Lin and colleagues (Lin et al., 2012), randomized 258 parent child pairs from the Childhood Cataract Program of the Chinese Ministry of Health to either receive SMS mobile phone appointment reminders or not. Re-scheduling was not permitted, except in cases of additional serious procedures being required. The SMS reminders significantly increased appointment attendance, and the authors found that the number needed to remind to gain 1 additional visit was 3.

### **SMS for Vaccinations**

Another area showing great promise for SMS interventions is in vaccination rates. There are no recent systematic reviews specifically focused on the use of text messaging to improve immunization uptake; however, a large body of evidence suggests text messages could be a useful tool for increasing immunization rates. A 2007 Cochrane review of reminders to improve immunization rates (Jacobson Vann and Szilagyi, 2005), which included all formats for reminder systems and reviewed 47 studies, found that increases in immunization rates due to reminders were in the range of 1 to 20 percentage points, and that for childhood vaccinations the OR was 1.47 (1.28 – 1.68). It found that all types of reminders were effective (postcards, letters, telephone, or autodialer calls) with telephone being both the most effective and most costly.

However, research specific to SMS intervention efficacy published since the 2007 update of the Cochrane review is limited and provides only mixed evidence on its impact on immunization rates. Kharbanda and colleagues performed a non-randomized trial comparing those patients of

nine participating New York City pediatric clinical sites whose parents enrolled in an SMS reminder system to those parents whose parents did not self-enroll. While there was a large significant difference in uptake between those whose parents enrolled and those who did not, an intent-to-treat analysis comparing vaccination rates amongst all patients whose parents were offered enrollment to all patents in the pre-intervention analysis found only a small and statistically insignificant increase in vaccination rates (Kharbanda et al., 2011). A 2012 RTC of 204 pregnant mothers in the U.S. found only a 1.7% (-11.1, 14.5%) increase in vaccination rates for seasonal flu between the study arm that received pregnancy-related general preventative health information via SMS and the study arm that received that received the same general messages as well as extra messages regarding the importance of influenza vaccination (Moniz et al., 2013). A 2012 pilot RTC of 90 newborns in Kansas found no statistical difference in vaccination status at 2, 4, or 6 months between children whose parents received a standard appointment card at the previous appointment and those who received both the appointment card and a reminder text message 7 days prior to the immunization due date (Ahlers-Schmidt et al., 2012). However the authors note that control group parents had higher annual income than intervention parents, suggesting that children in the control arm may have been more likely than intervention parents to immunize their children prior to the intervention.

In the most promising findings published since the Cochrane review, Stockwell and colleagues (Stockwell et al., 2012) randomized parents of 9213 children and adolescents in pediatric clinics in New York City to a text message intervention aimed at increasing influenza vaccination. The intervention group received a series of 5 weekly, automated text message influenza vaccine

reminders. Analysis of all participants at the fall review date showed 53.6% of the intervention group and 50.6% of the usual care group were vaccinated (RD=3.0%, (0.94, 5.10%).

The authors state that to their knowledge, their trial “is the first large, population-based randomized controlled trial of the effectiveness of text message vaccine reminders.”

### **SMS for Other Behavior Change**

Three systematic reviews have been published which have examined the use of text messaging as a vehicle for behavior change (Cole-Lewis and Kershaw, 2010; Fjeldsoe et al., 2009; Wei et al., 2011). These reviews have overlapped in the studies on which they draw, but each also has a unique set of studies not represented in the other reviews. However, none of them draw on the attendance rate or immunization rate literature. Table 1.1 lists the studies represented in each systematic review, and each paper is briefly summarized below.

**Table 1.1: Published SMS Interventions for Behavior Change from Literature Review**

First Author	Year	Intervention Target	Study design	Study Size	Fjeldsoe et al., 2009	Cole-Lewis & Kershaw 2010	Wei, Hollin, & Kachnowski 2011
Dunbar	2003	Antiretroviral Adherence	pilot	25			Y
Kwon	2004	Diabetes self-management	pre-post	185	Y		
Marquez	2004	Hypertension medication compliance	randomized cluster	104	Y		
Márquez Contreras	2004	Hypertension tablet adherence	RCT	104			Y
Obermayer	2004	Smoking cessation	pre-post	46	Y		Y
Vahatalo	2004	Diabetes self-management	nonparallel, non-RCT	200	Y		
Bramley**	2005	Smoking cessation	RCT	1705		Y	
Ostojic	2005	Asthma self-management	RCT	16	Y	Y	Y
Rodgers **	2005	Smoking cessation	RCT	1705	Y	Y	Y

**Table 1.1 (Continued)**

Rodgers **	2005	Smoking cessation	RCT	1705	Y	Y	Y
Franklin	2006	Diabetes self-management	RCT	92	Y	Y	Y
Rami	2006	Diabetes self-management	randomized crossover	36	Y	Y	
Robinson	2006	Bulimia nervosa outpatient care	pre-post	21	Y		
Benhamou	2007	Diabetes Management	randomized crossover	30		Y	
Hurling	2007	Physical Activity	RCT	77	Y		
Joo	2007	Anti-obesity behavior modification	pre-post	927	Y		
Kim (a) ++	2007	Diabetes self-management	RCT	60	Y	Y	Y
Kim (b) ++	2007	Diabetes Management	quasi-experimental	60		Y	
Kollman	2007	Diabetes self-management	pre-post	10	Y		
Logan	2007	Hypertension self management in diabetic patients	pre-post	33	Y		
Kim(a)++, ^	2008	Diabetes Management	quasi-experimental	60		Y	Y
Kim (b) ++	2008	Diabetes Management	quasi-experimental	60		Y	
Mao	2008	Medication adherence	pilot	100			Y
Shapiro	2008	Childhood weight loss control	RCT	58			Y
Spaniel	2008	Schizophrenia relapse prevention	pre-post	45			Y
Yoon ++, ^	2008	Diabetes Management	quasi-experimental	60		Y	Y
Armstrong	2009	Sunscreen use	RCT	70			Y
Cho	2009	Diabetes Management	RCT	75		Y	
Cocosila	2009	Adherence to vitamin regimen	RCT	102		Y	Y
Gerber	2009	Weight loss control	pilot	95			Y
Haapala	2009	Weight Loss	RCT	126		Y	Y
Hanauer	2009	Diabetes Management	RCT	40		Y	Y
Haug	2009	Smoking cessation	RCT	174			Y
Khokhar	2009	Breast self-examination	pre-post	106			Y
Miloh	2009	Immunosuppressant adherence	pre-post	41			Y



**Table 1.1 (Continued)**

Newton	2009	Physical Activity	RCT	78	Y	
Ollivier	2009	Malaria chemoprophylaxis adherence	RCT	424		Y
Patrick	2009	Weight Loss	RCT	65	Y	Y
Shapiro	2009	Bulimia nervosa self-monitor	pre-post	31		Y
Strand-bygaard	2010	Asthma treatment adherence	RCT	26		Y

\*\* These papers come from the same study.

++ These papers come from the same study.

^ Cole-Lewis & Kershaw describe these as quasi-experimental; Wei et al describes them as RCTs

### Fjeldsoe et al.

In the earliest of the three papers on the subject, Fjeldsoe and colleagues (Fjeldsoe et al., 2009) collected evidence based on the inclusion criteria that the intervention 1) be delivered primarily via SMS, 2) target a change in health behavior, 3) have at least a pre-post design, and 4) be published in English in a peer-reviewed journal. Their search found 14 studies that met their inclusion criteria. The authors found that significant, positive behavior change effects were found in eight studies, five studies demonstrated positive but not statistically significant trends, and that one found no trend. However, the authors state that “The broad range of study designs used and the varying use of specific SMS characteristics in interventions limit the conclusions that can be drawn from this review.” They recommend that “Future studies should use adequate sample sizes to provide sufficient statistical power for detecting hypothesized effects.”

### Cole-Lewis & Kershaw

In a 2010 study, Cole-Lewis & Kershaw (Cole-Lewis and Kershaw, 2010) review the use of text messaging as a tool for disease prevention and management. The authors searched for randomized or quasi-experimental controlled trials that used text messaging as the primary

(though not necessarily only) intervention for disease prevention or management, finding 17 articles representing 12 studies met their inclusion criteria. The authors report that three of the twelve studies were not sufficiently powered to detect a difference in the primary outcome, and were thus inconclusive, but that “Eight of the 9 sufficiently powered studies found evidence to support text messaging as a tool for behavior change in disease prevention ... and management.” (Cole-Lewis and Kershaw, 2010). The significant behavioral changes included greater prevalence of non-smoking by smokers and more frequent monitoring and reporting of blood glucose via text message compared with email. Significant clinical outcomes included greater weight loss in obese adults and larger declines in hemoglobin A1c levels in diabetics. Inconclusive behavioral results were found for adherence to using vitamins by healthy college students and physical activity as measured by daily step count. Inconclusive clinical results were found for peak expiratory levels in asthmatic adults.

Wei, Hollin, & Kachnowski

In the most recent review, Wei Hollin & Kachnowski reviewed the literature on text messaging for clinical and healthy behavior interventions (Wei et al., 2011). The authors excluded studies that were part of a package of which text messaging was only a component. Their final review included 24 articles that met their inclusion criteria; 7 were on medication adherence, 8 on clinical care management, and 9 on preventative behavior modification. The authors found that 10 of the 16 RCTS found significant improvements, and the remaining 6 suggested positive trends. Of the 5 pre-post studies, 4 found significant benefits and the other suggested a positive trend. Of the 3 feasibility pilots, all reported satisfaction and acceptability. Discussing the whole

set of research papers, the authors note that many studies were under-powered, and evaluation periods too short to make valid inferences about long-term efficacy.

### **LMIC Specific Evidence**

Nearly all of the above data comes from developed countries. In order to get a view of what may be the effect of SMS interventions in LMIC, two studies have conducted systematic reviews focused on LMIC SMS interventions which, unlike the above studies, pull heavily from the grey literature (Déglise et al., 2012; Gurman et al., 2012). The results of these studies are presented next.

#### *Déglise et al*

Focusing only in developing countries, the authors of this 2012 review examined SMS-supported interventions in four areas: prevention, surveillance, disease-management, and patient compliance. The authors found 98 SMS interventions, only 31 of which were evaluated. With regards to prevention, only four reported an evaluation, all of which were in the grey literature. The authors note that all evaluations were about process outcomes, and none included information about behavior change. Overall, the authors conclude that text messaging improved the process of care and was well accepted by both health workers and target populations. However, they also conclude there was a lack of high-quality intervention studies in the peer-reviewed literature, especially on clinical outcomes, with most outcomes reporting process or satisfaction (Déglise et al., 2012).

### Gurman et al.

The authors reviewed 44 articles in full, 16 of which reported evaluation data. Of the interventions presented in Gurman and colleagues review which are not already discussed above, there are two which quantitatively compare the SMS intervention results with a control. The first is a Kenyan trial on adherence to antiretroviral treatments, which reported significantly improved non-adherence (RR=0.81, (0.69, 0.94)) and lower occurrence of virologic failure (RR=0.84, (0.71, 0.99)) (Lester et al., 2010). Gurman and colleagues also report that the South African Project Masiluleke bulk text messaging of 1 million texts per day for a year was responsible for a 300% increase to an HIV hotline (Gurman et al., 2012)

### **Current SMS Evidence Summary & Conclusions**

SMS interventions are an effective means at increasing kept appointments, though they may or may not be as effective as voice reminders. Vaccine and immunization reminders have been generally found to be effective in increasing uptake, though the range of effectiveness is broad and SMS-specific evidence is scarce. Several small trials have failed to find significant effects in intent-to-treat analysis, but two very large trials found significant effects. Other behavior changes seem possible, and the literature is almost universally suggestive of positive effects. However, findings are often insignificant due to small sample sizes and insufficient statistical power. Also, significant positive change is more often found in process outcomes than in health outcomes. To date, no known studies have been published experimentally testing the use of an SMS intervention aiming to increase motorcycle helmet use have been published, nor are have any studies investigating an SMS intervention targeting change in pregnant women's mode of

delivery been published. Larger scale studies are recommended to further investigate the possibilities of SMS effectiveness.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahlers-Schmidt, C.R., Chesser, A.K., Nguyen, T., Brannon, J., Hart, T.A., Williams, K.S., Wittler, R.R., 2012. Feasibility of a randomized controlled trial to evaluate Text Reminders for Immunization Compliance in Kids (TRICKS). *Vaccine* 30, 5305–5309. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.06.058
- Chalya, P.L., Dass, R.M., Mchembe, M.D., Mbelenge, N., Ngayomela, I.H., Chandika, A.B., Gilyoma, J.M., Mabula, J.B., 2013. Citywide trauma experience in Mwanza, Tanzania: a need for urgent intervention. *J. Trauma Manag. Outcomes* 7, 1.
- Cole-Lewis, H., Kershaw, T., 2010. Text messaging as a tool for behavior change in disease prevention and management. *Epidemiol. Rev.* 32, 56–69.
- Déglise, C., Suggs, L.S., Odermatt, P., 2012. SMS for disease control in developing countries: a systematic review of mobile health applications. *J. Telemed. Telecare* 18, 273–281.
- Evans, W.D., Wallace, J.L., Snider, J., 2012. Pilot evaluation of the text4baby mobile health program. *BMC Public Health* 12, 1031. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-1031
- Fjeldsoe, B.S., Marshall, A.L., Miller, Y.D., 2009. Behavior Change Interventions Delivered by Mobile Telephone Short-Message Service. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 36, 165–173.
- Gurman, T.A., Rubin, S.E., Roess, A.A., 2012. Effectiveness of mHealth behavior change communication interventions in developing countries: a systematic review of the literature. *J. Health Commun.* 17, 82–104.
- Hasvold, P.E., Wootton, R., 2011. Use of telephone and SMS reminders to improve attendance at hospital appointments: a systematic review. *J. Telemed. Telecare* 17, 358.
- Jacobson Vann, J.C., Szilagyi, P., 2005. Patient reminder and recall systems to improve immunization rates. *Status Ed. No Change Conclusions.*
- Jareethum, R., Titapant, V., Tienthai, C., Viboonchart, S., Chuenwattana, P., Chatchainoppakhun, J., 2008. Satisfaction of Healthy Pregnant Women Receiving Short Message Service via Mobile Phone for Prenatal Support: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Med Assoc Thai* 91, 458–63.
- Kharbanda, E.O., Stockwell, M.S., Fox, H.W., Andres, R., Lara, M., Rickert, V.I., 2011. Text message reminders to promote human papillomavirus vaccination. *Vaccine* 29, 2537–2541.
- Lester, R.T., Ritvo, P., Mills, E.J., Kariri, A., Karanja, S., Chung, M.H., Jack, W., Habyarimana, J., Sadatsafavi, M., Najafzadeh, M., 2010. Effects of a mobile phone short message service on antiretroviral treatment adherence in Kenya (WelTel Kenya1): a randomised trial.
- Lin, H., Chen, Weirong, Luo, L., Congdon, N., Zhang, X., Zhong, X., Liu, Z., Chen, Wan, Wu, C., Zheng, D., Deng, D., Ye, S., Lin, Z., Zou, X., Liu, Y., 2012. Effectiveness of a short message reminder in increasing compliance with pediatric cataract treatment: a randomized trial. *Ophthalmology* 119, 2463–2470. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2012.06.046

- Lippke, S., Ziegelmann, J.P., 2008. Theory-Based Health Behavior Change: Developing, Testing, and Applying Theories for Evidence-Based Interventions. *Appl. Psychol. Int. Rev.* 57, 698–716.
- Liu, Y., Li, G., Chen, Y., Wang, X., Ruan, Y., Zou, L., Zhang, W., 2014. A descriptive analysis of the indications for caesarean section in mainland China. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 14.
- Lund, S., Hemed, M., Nielsen, B.B., Said, A., Said, K., Makungu, M.H., Rasch, V., 2012. Mobile phones as a health communication tool to improve skilled attendance at delivery in Zanzibar: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *BJOG Int. J. Obstet. Gynaecol.* 119, 1256–1264. doi:10.1111/j.1471-0528.2012.03413.x
- Moniz, M.H., Hasley, S., Meyn, L.A., Beigi, R.H., 2013. Improving Influenza Vaccination Rates in Pregnancy Through Text Messaging: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Obstet. Gynecol.*
- Murray, C.J., Vos, T., Lozano, R., Naghavi, M., Flaxman, A.D., Michaud, C., Ezzati, M., Shibuya, K., Salomon, J.A., Abdalla, S., others, 2013. Disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) for 291 diseases and injuries in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The lancet* 380, 2197–2223.
- National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2016. China's Economy Realized a Moderate but Stable and Sound Growth in 2015 [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.stats.gov.cn/english/PressRelease/201601/t20160119\\_1306072.html](http://www.stats.gov.cn/english/PressRelease/201601/t20160119_1306072.html) (accessed 3.7.16).
- Naughton, F., Prevost, A.T., Gilbert, H., Sutton, S., 2012. Randomized controlled trial evaluation of a tailored leaflet and SMS text message self-help intervention for pregnant smokers (MiQuit). *Nicotine Tob. Res. Off. J. Soc. Res. Nicotine Tob.* 14, 569–577. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntr254
- Noar, S.M., Zimmerman, R.S., 2005. Health Behavior Theory and cumulative knowledge regarding health behaviors: are we moving in the right direction? *Health Educ. Res.* 20, 275–290.
- Noordam, A.C., Kuepper, B.M., Stekelenburg, J., Milen, A., 2011. Improvement of maternal health services through the use of mobile phones. *Trop. Med. Int. Heal. TM IH* 16, 622–626. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2011.02747.x
- Stockwell, M.S., Kharbanda, E.O., Martinez, R.A., Vargas, C.Y., Vawdrey, D.K., Camargo, S., 2012. Effect of a text messaging intervention on influenza vaccination in an urban, low-income pediatric and adolescent population: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 307, 1702–1708. doi:10.1001/jama.2012.502
- Tamrat, T., Kachnowski, S., 2012. Special delivery: an analysis of mHealth in maternal and newborn health programs and their outcomes around the world. *Matern. Child Health J.* 16, 1092–1101. doi:10.1007/s10995-011-0836-3
- United Republic of Tanzania, 2009. National Road Safety Policy. Ministry of Infrastructure Development, Dar es Salaam.
- Wei, J., Hollin, I., Kachnowski, S., 2011. A review of the use of mobile phone text messaging in clinical and healthy behaviour interventions. *J. Telemed. Telecare* 17, 41–48.

## CHAPTER II

### The Impact Of Text Message (SMS) Reminders On Helmet Use Among Motorcycle Drivers In Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

#### ABSTRACT

**Objective:** To evaluate the impact of text message (SMS) reminders on helmet use among motorcycle taxi drivers in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

**Design:** A randomized controlled trial was conducted to measure the impact of two different types of SMS messages promoting consistent helmet use. Adherence to helmet use was evaluated by self-report through surveys conducted at baseline, 3 weeks and 6 weeks.

**Setting:** Participants were 391 commercial motorcycle taxi drivers across the three districts of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, recruited via convenience sampling at motorcycle taxi hubs where drivers congregate to attract passengers.

**Methods:** Participants were randomized into one of three groups, each receiving a different set of messages: 1) social norming messages aimed at emphasizing society's positive stance on helmet wearing, and; 2) fear appeal messages that emphasized the dangers of riding without a helmet, and 3) control group messages, which included basic road safety messages unrelated to helmet use. Every participant received the control messages. Texts were delivered in Kiswahili via MightyText, a mass-messaging platform, during off-peak hours for the drivers.

**Results:** Over a 6-week period, the odds of self-reporting consistent helmet use was estimated to be 1.58 times higher in the social norming group than in the control group ( $p=.043$ ), though this

difference is not significant for a Type I error rate of  $\alpha=.05$  after accounting for multiple testing by either the Holm-Bonferroni method or by Fisher's Least Significant Difference. There was little difference between fear appeal and control group recipients (OR= 1.03,  $p=.466$ ). Subgroup analysis suggests that both fear control and social norming message types might have been associated with increased helmet use among participants who did not consistently wear helmets at baseline (OR= 1.66, OR=1.84), but this was not significant for a Type I error rate of  $\alpha=.05$  ( $p=.109$ ,  $p=.071$ ). Amongst those who were consistent wearers at baseline, the social norming messages performed better than the fear appeal messages, and this difference reached traditional significance ( $p=.029$ ), but is not significant for a Type I error rate of  $\alpha=.05$  after accounting for multiple testing.

**Conclusions:** The use of SMS reminders may improve helmet use among motorcycle drivers when framed as social norming messages. Both fear appeal and social norming messages might have an effect on inconsistent wearers, but social norming messages seemed to outperform fear appeal messages, particularly amongst drivers who were already consistent helmet users. Given that nearly half of the drivers in our sample did not consistently wear their helmets on every trip, strategies to increase consistent usage could be an important benefit to public safety.

**Trial Registration:** [clinicaltrials.gov Identifier: NCT02120742](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT02120742)



## **I. Background**

Road traffic injury is a pressing and neglected public health issue in Tanzania, particularly for young men. According to the Global Burden of Disease 2010 Study, road traffic injury is the second leading cause of Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) for men ages 15-24 in the country (Murray et al., 2012). Men are particularly at high risk of road traffic injuries because nearly all drivers of motorcycle taxis (in Kiswahili, “bodabodas,” or for short, “bodas”), a major form of public transportation in the country, are men.

Studies have shown that helmet use can significantly reduce disability and death resulting from road traffic injuries (Liu et al., 2004). Because of this, efforts have been made by the Tanzanian government to develop tighter helmet use laws (United Republic of Tanzania, 2009). However, adherence to helmet use has remained dangerously low throughout the country (Chalya et al., 2012; Okyere, n.d.). This is partly because enforcement of laws is so limited (United Republic of Tanzania, 2009).

One promising intervention to promote helmet use is the introduction of SMS reminders delivered to boda drivers. There is substantial evidence that mobile health interventions utilizing SMS can lead to behavior change. For instance, in the largest study of its kind, texts reminding participants not to smoke significantly increased the chances that someone would stop smoking in a smoking cessation program (Free et al., 2011). Other studies have shown that text reminders can dramatically improve adherence to medication regimens (Park et al., n.d.; Vervloet et al., 2012). Because of the high prevalence of cell phone and SMS use in Tanzania, especially among

young people, the context is appropriate for such an intervention (Lancaster, 2015). To address the pervasive issue of limited helmet use, we implemented an innovative program, which delivers SMS messages to boda drivers over a 6-week period, reminding and persuading them to wear their helmets. To date, no program like this has been implemented and rigorously evaluated. This study fills a critical research gap by evaluating this unique SMS program in the form of a randomized, controlled trial. The literature suggests that it takes approximately 21 to 42 days to form a new habit, so the 6-week study period was determined to be a sufficient time period to measure changes in helmet use (Burns, 2008; Nikolajsen and Jensen, 2001). The rate of consistent helmet wearing at the study's 6-week endpoint is the primary outcome of interest in this study.

In addition to evaluating whether text reminders increase helmet use, this study also aims to measure which type of message leads to the greatest increase in helmet use. Substantial evidence from the field of behavioral psychology shows that the framing of messages affects the level of behavior change. For instance, recent studies have shown that messages informing college students that a majority of their peers do not binge drink can lead to a significant decrease in binge drinking (Rosenberg, 1364389203). This type of messaging, based on what is referred to as the social norming model, could prove a more effective way of communicating road safety messages, particularly for men, than a longstanding health communication method, which is an appeal to fear. Findings from two recent studies support this idea by showing that road safety advertisements threats of social consequences, such as the threat of losing one's driving license, were more effective at changing young males' driving behaviors than were advertisements depicting harsh physical consequences (Harré et al., 2005; Lennon et al., 2010). The fear appeal

method, while historically prominent in the field of public health, has more recently shown to be ineffective in leading to behavior change, especially among young men (Wundersitz et al., 2010). For example, a study by Woolley et al. demonstrated that men often dissociate their own speeding behaviors from a social problem and therefore perceive related fear appeals as being directed more towards others than themselves (Wundersitz et al., 2010). This is consistent with a broader trend in the psychology of aging literature wherein younger adults are more motivated by potential rewards than loss aversion, a balance that reverses in older adulthood (Ebner et al., 2006). In this study, we test social norming and fear appeal messages against a control and against each other to see which, if either, has a greater impact on helmet use.

## **II. Study Design**

We conducted a randomized, controlled trial to evaluate the impact of a SMS program on helmet use among boda drivers in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects) at Dartmouth College, USA, and the Ethics Review Committee at Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS), Tanzania. Participants were recruited in a convenience sample from the general population of boda drivers in three districts of in Dar es Salaam. Boda drivers were approached at boda stands, which are defined as having three or more boda drivers waiting for clients. The inclusion criteria required participants to be 18 years or older, to own a mobile telephone with SMS capabilities, to demonstrate the ability to retrieve SMS messages, and to have access to a helmet. Pre-intervention power calculations indicated that 385 participants would be needed to detect a 20 percentage point increase in consistent helmet use over an

anticipated baseline of 32.4% being consistent users. In total, 391 participants were recruited into the study. There were no incentives to join the study.

All participants were informed that they would receive three SMS messages a week. Based on a pre-study questionnaire, it was determined that the best time to deliver SMS messages was between 6am and 7am, during off-peak hours. Participants were randomized into three different arms using a random number generator, with each group receiving a different types of message: 1) social norming (for example, “Most of your peers properly wear their helmet every day – do you?”); 2) fear appeal (for example, “If you do not wear your helmet while driving, you will increase your chances of injury”); and 3) control, which included basic road safety messages (for example, “This is a short reminder to not speed while driving your boda”). Groups 1 and 2 received the control message in addition to their group-specific messages. The information in the social-norming messages and that in the fear appeal messages was designed to be both motivational and accurate, and was based on literature review on motorcycle helmet use and road safety in Tanzania and the surrounding region. Participants received the intervention between May and June 2014. Three texts per week were delivered in the local language, Kiswahili, using a mass-messaging platform called MightyText. Texts were sent Monday, Wednesday, and Friday mornings. For the complete list of messages in English and Swahili, and the literature source for each message, please see Appendix 2.1.

Randomization proceeded in a four-step process that was designed to create matched triplets of drivers and to randomly assign one member from each triplet to each of the three study arms. The four steps were as follows: First, a logistic regression of consistent helmet use on

demographic and other driving habit covariates was used to create a propensity score for predicting baseline helmet use. Second, participants were stratified into two groups: those who at baseline reported they had consistently worn their helmet on all trips in the past two weeks, and those who reported inconsistent use. Third, within each stratum, triplets of 3 participants were made by beginning with the individual with the lowest propensity score in the stratum, and assigning the 3 individuals with the lowest, then next 3 lowest, etc. to the same “propensity triplet”. One individual with the highest score remained unmatched into a triplet. Fourth and finally, for each triplet an integer from 1 to 6 was randomly drawn with replacement. Each integer represented one of the 6 permutations by which three (ordered) individuals may be assigned one each to three different treatments: (ABC, ACB, BAC, BCA, CAB, CBA). The individuals in the triplet were thereby simultaneously assigned to an arm of the study, with one member of each triplet in each treatment arm. The last individual with the highest score was similarly assigned, and treated as the lowest score in their own triplet.

Matching in this fashion had two aims: First, it created equally sized treatment arms which maximized statistical power across the planned group comparisons. Secondly, it was intended to balance the drivers’ unobservable propensity to wear helmets across treatment arms by ensuring that baseline helmet use and predicted helmet use were balanced across treatment arms. By stratifying randomization by baseline helmet wearing, we assured that equal numbers of consistent wearers and inconsistent wearers were in each study arm. Within both strata, matching into triplets based on close propensity scores prior to random assignment assured that estimated propensity to consistently wear helmets was also evenly distributed across treatment arms as each member of the “propensity triplet” went to each treatment arm. Matching on a propensity

score constructed from observable covariates has been shown to be sufficient to remove bias from all covariates used to construct the propensity score (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983). Though this technique was originally conceived to improve causal inference in observational studies, matching on relevant covariates before treatment assignment in randomized experiments is now a common practice that can increase efficiency of estimation and the power of hypothesis tests (Greevy et al., 2004). Moreover, inadvertently matching on irrelevant covariates prior to a random assignment does not harm statistical efficiency or power (Greevy et al., 2004).

Participant adherence to helmet use was captured through self-report surveys at baseline, at the three week midpoint of the experiment, and at six weeks at the conclusion of the experiment.

### **III. Study Population Baseline Characteristics**

The baseline characteristics of the study population are shown in Table 2.1 for all observed variables. The mean age of participants was 28, all participants were men, and a majority had at most an elementary level education. At baseline, approximately 53% of participants claimed that they wore their helmet on every trip, which was more than the 32% anticipated from previous literature review and on which our power calculations were based. There were no statistically significant differences across treatments for any observed variable. Self-reporting of consistent helmet wearing was perfectly balanced across treatment arms by the stratified design of the randomization method.

**TABLE 2.1: Balance Check for All Observed Baseline Variables**

<b>Baseline Variable</b>	<b>Social Norming</b>	<b>Fear Appeal</b>	<b>Control</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Test</b>	<b>Test Statistic</b>	<b>P Value</b>
District							
District 1	32.2%	36.6%	32.3%	391	Chi-2	$X^2 = 0.79$	0.789
District 2	42.3%	46.6%	47.7%				
District 3	18.5%	16.8%	20.0%				
Age	28.6 (6.4)	27.6 (6.7)	27.9 (5.9)	384	Anova	$F = 0.86$	0.432
Education							
Elementary or none	67.7%	69.1%	72.0%	375	Chi-2	$X^2 = 0.57$	0.753
Jr. High or Above	32.3%	30.9%	28.0%				
Currently Married	65.4%	67.5%	65.6%	381	Chi-2	$X^2 = 0.15$	0.929
Has Children	62.7%	66.1%	63.3%	378	Chi-2	$X^2 = 0.37$	0.833
Cell Phone Self Owned	100.0%	100.0%	98.4%	380	Chi-2	$X^2 = 4.05$	0.132
Household Size	5.19 (2.4)	5.28 (3.2)	4.93 (2.2)	386	Chi-2	$F = 0.59$	0.555
Primary Driving Setting							
Urban / Downtown	19.7%	22.3%	24.4%	380	Chi-2	$X^2 = 2.81$	0.591
Suburban / Residential	18.9%	24.6%	18.7%				
Both Equally	61.4%	53.1%	56.9%				
Night Driving Frequency							
Never	26.4%	32.3%	27.7%	389	Chi-2	$X^2 = 3.00$	0.809
Sometimes	31.8%	33.1%	34.6%				
Usually	24.8%	20.0%	25.4%				
Always	17.1%	14.6%	12.3%				
Wears Helmet Consistently	53.1%	52.7%	53.1%	391	Chi-2	$X^2 = 0.01$	0.997
Speeding Frequency							
Never	11.5%	13.9%	15.4%	390	Chi-2	$X^2 = 3.55$	0.737
Sometimes	31.5%	32.3%	27.7%				
Usually	50.0%	49.2%	58.9%				
Always	6.9%	4.6%	3.1%				
Weekend Driving							
Never	6.9%	2.3%	5.4%	391	Chi-2	$X^2 = 8.71$	0.191
Sometimes	16.2%	27.5%	25.4%				
Usually	23.1%	25.2%	24.6%				
Always	53.9%	45.0%	44.6%				

#### IV. Statistical Methods

The primary outcome of the study was self-reported adherence to helmet use as measured by the question: “In the past week, how often did you wear your helmet: 1) Every trip; 2) Not every

trip.” The adherence rate in each group was defined as the percentage of participants who reported that they have used their helmet on all boda trips. Our primary outcome was to compare this rate between experimental groups and between each experimental group and the control. A secondary outcome was heterogeneity of treatment effect by baseline helmet use habits.

A reliance on self-reports potentially introduces measurement error due to possible social-desirability bias. Because helmet use is legally required, participants may have reported wearing them frequently so as to be viewed positively (and compliant with the law). However, no technologically feasible way to objectively monitor helmet use on all trips was readily apparent. We aimed to overcome the social desirability bias by insuring that the survey responses were anonymous. One indication that this strategy may have been successful is shown in survey respondent’s self-reported frequency of speeding; interestingly, 56% of respondents were willing to admit to exceeding speed limits “frequently” or “always.” Another 30% reported speeding at least “sometimes.” Speeding would be expected to be subject to the same social desirability bias, as helmet use, but many respondents were willing to self-report this behavior in the anonymous survey.

With 391 participants, the study was 80% powered to detect a 23-percentage point increase in the proportion of drivers who always wear their helmets. This power calculation included adjusting for the goal of remaining significant after Bonferroni correction for multiple testing to ensure the ability to make all three possible comparisons between the two treatment and control groups. The study plan indicated that in the final analysis the Holm-Bonferroni algorithm would be used to correct for multiple hypothesis testing, which yields uniformly more power than the



Bonferroni correction while still controlling the familywise error rate. However, the Holm-Bonferroni algorithm, while simple to perform post-hoc, is actually quite complicated to properly incorporate into prior power calculations, and the simpler Bonferroni correction was used instead to find a minimum bound to the study's power. Both forms of the Bonferroni method have been criticized as being overly stringent, sacrificing unnecessary power to absolutely ensure the desired maximum Type I error rate. As such, this study also performed Fisher's Least Significant Difference (Fisher's LSD) as a sensitivity check. Fisher's LSD has been criticized as flawed for more than three group comparisons (Hayter, 1986), but is appropriate in this setting as it only makes three group comparisons.

To investigate the effect of treatment arm assignment, several specifications logistic regression of consistent helmet use on treatment assignment were run. All statistical analyses were performed using R version 3.0.2. Unadjusted and covariate adjusted regressions were both modeled, and all specifications were structured to estimate an intent to treat effect. Details individual specifications will be discussed further below. For all group comparisons in all specifications, statistical significance of group difference was performed by permutation analysis in the following steps. First, the specification was run on all data using the true treatment assignment. Next, the analysis was re-run with each triplet of individuals (falsely) re-randomized with replacement to one of the six possible permutations of treatment assignments for that triplet. In permutation analysis, re-randomization must occur at the same level as in the true randomization design. Performing this analysis with many permutations wherein analyzed treatment assignment had no relation to the intervention or associated outcomes recreates the distribution of the null hypothesis in which treatment and outcomes are unrelated. The analysis

was run with 5000-10000 permutations (depending on the specification), and significance was assessed by the percentage of runs in which the null distribution yielded results of larger magnitude than that of the true treatment assignment. Permutations tests such as this have been shown to be valid for conducting any test of a null hypothesis of no treatment effect within an experimental sample, conditional on the single requirement that treatment has been randomly assigned (Anderson, 2001).

## V. Results

After baseline measurement, the intervention was delivered over a 6-week period, with helmet-use measurement at Week 3 and Week 6. The primary outcome of interest is the proportion self-reporting consistent helmet use at week 6. Unadjusted levels of reported helmet use for each group at both time points is shown in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2. Percentage of Drivers Reporting Helmet Use Every Trip (All Time Points)**

All Observations		Control	Fear Appeal	Social Norming
	Baseline N	130	131	130
	Baseline %	53.1%	52.7%	53.1%
	Difference from Control	0.0	-0.4	0.0
	Week 3 N	113	117	122
	Week 3 %	54.9%	53.0%	57.4%
	Difference from Control	0.0	-1.9	2.5
	Week 6 N	110	118	116
	Week 6 %	52.7%	53.4%	63.8%
	Difference from Control	0.0	0.7	11.1
	Week 6 Difference in Difference	0.0	1.1	11.1

The final row represents the difference between the group's week 6 difference from control and the group's baseline difference from control.

Potential heterogeneity of effect by randomization strata was investigated by analyzing participants in two subgroups based on whether they were or were not consistent helmet wearers at baseline. Intervention effects had strong potential be different in magnitude between these strata because the mechanism of effect was necessarily different between these two groups. Amongst already consistent wearers, the only possible mechanism of effect is maintenance of adherence amongst the already adherent, whereas for the inconsistent wearers, the only possible mechanism of effect is promotion of adherence amongst the not yet adherent. Knowledge about heterogeneity or consistency of effect is important for future targeting of interventions. Unadjusted results are shown in Table 2.3.

**Table 2.3: Percent of drivers reporting helmet use every trip at 6 weeks, by baseline answer.**

<b>Subgroup: Baseline "Consistent Wearers"</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Fear Appeal (FA)</b>	<b>Social Norming (SN)</b>
	Week 6 N	60	60	59
	Week 6 %	66.7%	58.3%	76.3%
	Difference from Control	0.0	-8.3	9.6
<b>Subgroup: Baseline "Inconsistent Wearers"</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Fear Appeal (FA)</b>	<b>Social Norming (SN)</b>
	Week 6 N	50	58	57
	Week 6%	36.0%	48.3%	50.9%
	Difference from Control	0.0	12.3	14.9

The results in Table 2.2 show that the Fear Appeal and Control groups showed little change over the 6-week period. However, the group receiving Social Norming SMS messages showed a final 11.1% lead over the control group in consistent helmet wearing despite their initial equal levels.

The results in Table 2.3 potentially indicate even more striking differences between treatment arms. Amongst drivers always wearing their helmets at baseline, all treatment groups had drivers that dropped down to inconsistent use. Notably, the social norming arm had 9.6% more drivers stay consistent than the control arm, and the fear appeal group actually had 8.3% *fewer*, potentially denoting a detrimental effect of fear messages in this subgroup. Amongst drivers that began as inconsistent helmet wearers, 36% of the control group became consistent helmet wearers, but the gains in the fear appeal and social norming arms were even larger, by 12.3% and 14.9% respectively.

Tables 2.2 and 2.3 are presented for easy visualization of group level differences. Hypothesis testing was performed with logistic regression and p-values were generated via non-parametric permutation testing to account for the correlations induced by the multi-step randomization process. Results of hypothesis testing are presented in Tables 2.4 and 2.5. Regression results unadjusted for any covariates are shown in Table 2.4, which tests the odds ratios associated with the risk differences presented in Tables 2.2 and 2.3. The first two columns display test results of whether and how each treatment arm statistically differed from the control arm. The final column shows the results of tests whether and how effects the two treatment arms statistically differ from each other. The first row of Table 2.4 presents these tests using all observations. The second and third rows present these same tests within the two subgroups of baseline “Always Wearers”

and baseline “Inconsistent Wearers.” Whether there was a heterogeneous effect of treatment assignment by this baseline subgrouping is displayed in the last row of Table 2.4, which tests for effect modification by taking the ratio of the odds ratios between the subgroups and testing whether this ratio is significant via permutation.

In comparing the two intervention arms to the control arm, one-sided tests of significance were used, justified by the strong a priori expectation that the two message types would only encourage, not discourage, helmet wearing. However, because we had no such a priori expectation that one messaging intervention would work better than the other, a two-sided test was used whenever comparing the social norming and fear appeal groups.

**Table 2.4: Pairwise Treatment Group Comparisons of Odds of Consistent Helmet Wearing (Using Coefficient Results of *Unadjusted Logistic Regression*)**

		<b>Fear Appeal : Control Group Comparison</b>	<b>Social Norming : Control Group Comparison</b>	<b>Social Norming : Fear Appeal Group Comparison</b>
All Observations	Odds Ratio	1.03	1.58	1.54
	P-Value	0.466 <sup>a</sup>	0.043 <sup>a**</sup>	0.119 <sup>b</sup>
Subgroup: Baseline "Always Wearers"	Odds Ratio	0.70	1.61	2.30
	P-Value	0.813 <sup>a</sup>	0.113 <sup>a</sup>	0.034 <sup>b**</sup>
Subgroup: Baseline "Inconsistent Wearers"	Odds Ratio	1.66	1.84	1.11
	P-Value	0.109 <sup>a</sup>	0.071 <sup>a*</sup>	0.796 <sup>b</sup>
Subgroup Effect Modification	Ratio of Odds Ratios	0.42	0.87	2.07
	P-Value	0.159 <sup>b</sup>	0.815 <sup>b</sup>	0.209 <sup>b</sup>

All p-values determined by permutation analysis.

a: denotes one sided test, b: denotes two sided test

\* denotes  $p < .10$ , \*\* denotes  $p < .05$

Using all observations in an unadjusted analysis, participants in the social norming arm had odds of consistently wearing their helmet that were 1.58 times the odds in the control group, which was the strongest measured association. Jointly testing all three possible group comparisons amongst all participants is this study's primary, trial registered outcome, and it was pre-planned to use a Holm-Bonferroni correction to account for this multiple testing. The one-sided p-value of 0.043 comparing the social norming arm to the control arm was not enough to satisfy the Holm-Bonferroni cutoff for simultaneously testing three null hypotheses, which requires that the most significant of three p-values be less than or equal to  $0.05/3 = 0.0167$  to set a maximum Type I family-wise error rate of .05.

Within the subgroup of participants that started as consistent helmet wearers, neither intervention arm differed significantly from the control arm. The social norming group was measured to have 2.30 times the odds of the fear appeal group of consistently wearing their helmets ( $p=.034$ ). However this is non-significant under the Holm-Bonferroni correction for simultaneously testing three group differences in this subset, which again requires  $p<0.0167$ . Accounting for testing several subsets of data would push the already missed boundary for significance even lower. In the subgroup of participants that were not consistent users at baseline, both intervention arms out-performed the control group, but their gains, while perhaps clinically meaningful in size, were not statistically significant at a threshold of  $p<.05$ . Finally, the lowest portion of Table 2.4 investigates whether the same message arms had different effects between the two subgroups: baseline always wearers and baseline inconsistent wearers. While the measured effects had seemingly large differences across subgroups, these differences had p-values well above .05.

After the unadjusted analysis, the same set of logistic regressions was performed including a set of demographic factors and baseline driving habits as controls. These controls were as follows: marital status, driving setting (primarily downtown or primarily suburban portions of the city), frequency of driving at night, and frequency of driving on the weekend. This list of controls was somewhat smaller than originally intended for several reasons. Firstly, all participants were male, and only two reported not being the owner of the motorcycle they rode, precluding the analysis of gender and ownership as factors. Originally age and whether the driver had children were intended to be included in the controls, but strong multi-collinearity between age, marital status, and having children precluded using all three simultaneously. Marital status was deemed to be the best summary indicator of the three as its effect was most consistent and interpretable across specifications. Also, large amounts of missingness in self-reported income precluded its inclusion as a control variable. Table 2.5 reports the results of the adjusted logistic regressions.

**Table 2.5: Pairwise Treatment Group Comparisons of Odds of Consistent Helmet Wearing (Using Coefficient Results of *Covariate-Adjusted Logistic Regression*)**

		<b>Fear Appeal : Control</b>	<b>Social Norming : Control</b>	<b>Social Norming: Fear Appeal</b>
All Observations	Odds Ratio	1.01	1.57	1.55
	P-Value	0.491 <sup>a</sup>	0.055 <sup>a*</sup>	0.119 <sup>b</sup>
Subgroup: Baseline "Always Wearers"	Odds Ratio	0.62	1.58	2.54
	P-Value	0.865 <sup>a</sup>	0.147 <sup>a</sup>	0.03 <sup>b**</sup>
Subgroup: Baseline "Inconsistent Wearers"	Odds Ratio	1.84	1.90	1.03
	P-Value	0.086 <sup>a*</sup>	0.075 <sup>a*</sup>	0.933 <sup>b</sup>
Subgroup Effect Modification	Odds Ratio	0.34	0.83	2.46
	P-Value	0.073 <sup>b*</sup>	0.76 <sup>b</sup>	0.154 <sup>b</sup>

**Table 2.5 (Continued)**

All p-values determined by permutation analysis

a: denotes one sided test, b: denotes two sided test

\* denotes  $p < .10$ , \*\* denotes  $p < .05$

The results in Table 2.5 follow those in Table 2.4 with relatively minor deviations. Given that the included variables were part of the original propensity score matching, it is unsurprising that their inclusion fails to alter the analysis in any meaningful way.

**VI. Discussion**

The results of our study show that social norming messages are potentially effective at increasing helmet use among motorcycle taxi “boda” drivers in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Over the 6-week period, the group receiving social norming SMS messages showed an increase in helmet use from 53.1% to 63.8%, and that increase achieved traditional significance ( $p < .05$ ) when compared to the control group with  $p = .043$ . However accounting for multiple testing means that we cannot reject the null of no association, as this p value is above the required  $p < .0167$  to maintain a family-wise Type I error rate of at most .05 when making three group comparisons. In contrast, the fear appeal and control groups showed little change over the 6-week period, and the changes in the rate of consistent helmet use were not statistically significant comparing the fear appeal group to control.

While the main finding shows that the group receiving social norming messages increased helmet adherence the most, though not statistically significantly, the findings also suggest that responsiveness to messages may also have been determined by participant baseline response. Specifically, for those who reported not wearing helmets all the time at baseline, both social



norming and fear appeal messages were associated with higher adherence after the 6-week study period compared to the control group. Though shy of statistical significance due to the power limitation of restricting the sample, the associated odds ratios imply a near doubling of the odds of consistent usage, and the close similarity of the odds ratios between the two treatment arms suggests that initial inconsistent wearers are equally sensitive to both types of messages. However, amongst those who reported consistent helmet wearing at baseline, those recipients of social norming messages maintained high levels of adherence, while those receiving fear appeal messages actually decreased their level of consistent wearing compared to the control. While neither treatment is associated with a statistical difference from the control in this subgroup, the combination of a positive association in the social norming arm and a deleterious association in the fear appeal arm results in a traditionally significant improvement of the social norming arm over the fear appeal arm (OR=2.30,  $p=0.034$ ). However, this association does not meet the Holm-Bonferroni requirement of  $p=.0167$ .

These findings have important potential implications for policymakers as well as other stakeholders in road safety. Firstly, because social norming messaging overall showed a potentially greater association with consistent helmet use than fear appeal messaging, it could be strategic for regulators and nongovernmental organizations focusing on road traffic safety to use social norming messages for any mass message or media campaigns to promote road safety and behavior change among drivers. However, a larger and more highly powered study would be required to confirm this differential association. Moreover, given the low cost of implementation and the overall satisfaction of the program among boda drivers, this type of intervention shows potential in future road safety messaging campaigns. Finally, intervention designers should note

that behavior change may take some time to set in amongst drivers; group level differences were noticeable at six weeks, but not after three weeks.

## **VII. Limitations**

There are several limitations to this study. First, self-reports introduce the possibility of social desirability bias among the respondents thanks to the legal requirement that helmets be worn at all times. A second potential bias in this study is simply recall bias. Our main outcome question asks for an estimate of helmet use in the past week of boda driving. It is possible that drivers had difficulty remembering with accuracy the level of helmet wearing during that time. However, we believed that asking about behavior over the past week was a reasonable amount of time to ensure accuracy of estimates. Moreover, the recall burden is much lower in answering consistency than that in answering the number of times or other numeric answers. Thirdly, while the results can be useful in a Tanzanian urban context, they may not be applicable to other contexts. Finally, the study was conducted in a convenience sample. The representativeness of the sample for Dar es Salaam boda drivers is left unknown. Fourth, our study measures effects of the intervention right after completion of the six-week trial. How long measured effects persist into the future is unknown. Finally, our study is focused on helmet usage, while the ultimate goal of such an intervention is better health and safety for drivers on the road. This study was not structured or powered to detect differences in health outcomes by treatment arm, and further study would be necessary to determine if such a messaging intervention would improve health outcomes for drivers.

## VIII. Conclusion

Though the evidence isn't fully conclusive, this study suggests that SMS reminders can be an effective way to improve helmet use among motorcycle drivers. Specifically, social norming messages appear to be more effective than fear appeal messages when trying to increase helmet use among boda drivers. Furthermore, for drivers who already wear their helmet consistently, fear appeal messages may actually have a detrimental effect on helmet use. Future research should further investigate whether social norming messages are more effective than fear appeals when trying to change behavior.

### Competing Interests

The author declares no competing interests.

### Human subject research ethics

This study was reviewed and approved by IRB committees at Dartmouth College, USA and Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, M.J., 2001. Permutation tests for univariate or multivariate analysis of variance and regression. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 58, 626–639.
- Burns, S., 2008. Installing a new habit and breaking an old one. Stephanie Burns Artic. Stephanieburns Comarticlesarticle06habit Asp.
- Chalya, P.L., Dass, R.M., Mchembe, M.D., Mbelenge, N., Ngayomela, I.H., Chandika, A.B., Gilyoma, J.M., Mabula, J.B., 2013. Citywide trauma experience in Mwanza, Tanzania: a need for urgent intervention. *J. Trauma Manag. Outcomes* 7, 9. doi:10.1186/1752-2897-7-9
- Chalya, P.L., Mabula, J.B., Dass, R.M., Mbelenge, N., Ngayomela, I.H., Chandika, A.B., Gilyoma, J.M., 2012. Injury characteristics and outcome of road traffic crash victims at Bugando Medical Centre in Northwestern Tanzania. *J. Trauma Manag. Outcomes* 6, 1. doi:10.1186/1752-2897-6-1
- Ebner, N.C., Freund, A.M., Baltes, P.B., 2006. Developmental changes in personal goal orientation from young to late adulthood: from striving for gains to maintenance and prevention of losses. *Psychol. Aging* 21, 664.
- Free, C., Knight, R., Robertson, S., Whittaker, R., Edwards, P., Zhou, W., Rodgers, A., Cairns, J., Kenward, M.G., Roberts, I., 2011. Smoking cessation support delivered via mobile

- phone text messaging (txt2stop): a single-blind, randomised trial. *The Lancet* 378, 49–55. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60701-0
- Greevy, R., Lu, B., Silber, J.H., Rosenbaum, P., 2004. Optimal multivariate matching before randomization. *Biostatistics* 5, 263–275.
- Harré, N., Foster, S., O'Neill, M., 2005. Self-enhancement, crash-risk optimism and the impact of safety advertisements on young drivers. *Br. J. Psychol.* 96, 215–230.
- Hayter, A.J., 1986. The maximum familywise error rate of Fisher's least significant difference test. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 81, 1000–1004.
- Lancaster, H., 2015. Tanzania - Telecoms, Mobile and Broadband - Statistics and Analyses.
- Lennon, R., Rentfro, R., O'Leary, B., 2010. Social marketing and distracted driving behaviors among young adults: The effectiveness of fear appeals. *Acad. Mark. Stud. J.* 14, 95.
- Liu, B., Ivers, R., Norton, R., Blows, S., Lo, S.K., 2004. Helmets for preventing injury in motorcycle riders. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 4, 1–42.
- M. Galukande, J.J., n.d. Boda-boda Injuries a Health Problem and a Burden of Disease in Uganda: a Tertiary Hospital Survey. *East Cent. Afr. J. Surg.* ISSN 1024-297X Vol 14 Num 2.
- Mcharo, B., 2012. Motorcycle crash: injuries pattern and associated factors among patients treated at Muhimbili Orthopaedic Institute (MOI). (Thesis). Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences.
- Murray, C.J.L., Vos, T., Lozano, R., Naghavi, M., Flaxman, A.D., et al., 2012. Disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) for 291 diseases and injuries in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet* 380, 2197–2223. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61689-4
- Mwakapasa, E.G., 2011. Attitude towards and practice of helmet use among commercial motorcyclists in Dar es salaam region, Tanzania. Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences.
- Nikolajsen, L., Jensen, T.S., 2001. Phantom limb pain. *Br. J. Anaesth.* 87, 107–116.
- Nyoni, J.E., Masaoe, E.N., 2011. Factors contributing to high frequency of vulnerable road user injury in Dar Es Salaam.
- Okyere, S., n.d. Attitude towards and practice of helmet use among commercial motorcyclists in Dar es Salaam region, Tanzania [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.academia.edu/5249218/ATTITUDE\\_TOWARDS\\_AND\\_PRACTICE\\_OF\\_HELMET\\_USE\\_AMONG\\_COMMERCIAL\\_MOTORCYCLISTS\\_IN\\_DAR\\_ES\\_SALAA\\_M\\_REGION\\_TANZANIA](http://www.academia.edu/5249218/ATTITUDE_TOWARDS_AND_PRACTICE_OF_HELMET_USE_AMONG_COMMERCIAL_MOTORCYCLISTS_IN_DAR_ES_SALAA_M_REGION_TANZANIA) (accessed 12.15.13).
- Park, L.G., Howie-Esquivel, J., Chung, M.L., Dracup, K., n.d. A text messaging intervention to promote medication adherence for patients with coronary heart disease: A randomized controlled trial. *Patient Educ. Couns.* doi:10.1016/j.pec.2013.10.027
- Phillipo L Chalya, J.B.M., 2010. Motorcycle injuries as an emerging public health problem in Mwanza City, north-western Tanzania. *Tanzan. J. Heal. Res.* 12, 214–21.
- Rosenbaum, P.R., Rubin, D.B., 1983. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika* 70, 41–55.
- Rosenberg, T., 1364389203. The Destructive Influence of Imaginary Peers [WWW Document]. Opinionator. URL <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/03/27/the-destructive-influence-of-imaginary-peers/> (accessed 4.1.16).

- Saidi, H., Mutisto, B.K., 2013. Motorcycle injuries at a tertiary referral hospital in Kenya: injury patterns and outcome. *Eur. J. Trauma Emerg. Surg.* 39, 481–485. doi:10.1007/s00068-013-0280-8
- United Republic of Tanzania, 2009. National Road Safety Policy. Ministry of Infrastructure Development, Dar es Salaam.
- Vervloet, M., van Dijk, L., Santen-Reestman, J., van Vlijmen, B., van Wingerden, P., Bouvy, M.L., de Bakker, D.H., 2012. SMS reminders improve adherence to oral medication in type 2 diabetes patients who are real time electronically monitored. *Int. J. Med. Inf.* 81, 594–604. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2012.05.005
- Wundersitz, L.N., Hutchinson, T.P., Woolley, J.E., 2010. Best practice in road safety mass media campaigns: A literature review. *Soc. Psychol.* 5, 119–186.

## APPENDIX 2.1: SMS Message Bank

### Social Norming:

English	Most boda drivers in Dar wear their helmet every day they drive on the street.
Swahili	Madereva wengi wa bodaboda wa Dar wanavaa helmet kila siku wanapoendesha mitaani.

Source: Amend observational study

English	Did you know that most boda drivers on [X road]* wear their helmet every day?
Swahili	Je unafahamu kwamba madereva wengi wa bodaboda kwenye barabara (X) huvaa helmet kila siku?

Source: Amend observational study

\* Majority of observed boda drivers on Pugu road, New Bagamoyou Road, Morogoro Road were wearing helmet

English	Most of your peers properly wear their helmet every day – do you?
Swahili	Wenzako wengi huvaa kwa usahihi helmet zao kila waendeshapo bodaboda- na wewe je?

Source: Amend observational study

English	Most boda drivers believe wearing their helmet is important even for short trips
Swahili	Madereva wengi wa bodaboda wanaamini kuvaa helmeti ni muhimu hata kwa safari fupi

Source: (Mwakapasa, 2011)

English	Most boda drivers believe that wearing a helmet is important even during hot weather
Swahili	Madereva wengi wa bodaboda wanaamini kuvaa helmeti ni muhimu hata wakati wa joto

Source: (Mwakapasa, 2011)

English	Most boda drivers in Dar say that wearing their helmet regularly is easy and comfortable
Swahili	Madereva wengi wa bodaboda wanasema kuvaa helmeti mara kwa mara ni rahisi na vizuri

Source: (Mwakapasa, 2011)

### **Fear Appeal:**

Based on:

(Chalya et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2004; M. Galukande, n.d.; Mcharo, 2012; Nyoni and Masaoe, 2011; Phillip L Chalya, 2010; Saidi and Mutisto, 2013)

English	Helmets decrease the chance of you dying in an accident.
Swahili	Helmet inapunguza nafasi ya wewe kufa kwenye ajali.

English	Road traffic accidents are the number 1 cause of death for boda drivers in Tanzania. Make sure to wear your helmet.
Swahili	Ajali za barabarai ni sababu namba 1 ya vifo kwa madereva wa bodaboda Tanzania. Hakikisha unavaa helmet yako.

Source: Global Burden of Disease 2010 Study

English	If you do not wear your helmet while driving, you will increase your chances of injury.
Swahili	Ikiwa hauta vaa helmet yako wakati unaendesha, utaongeza nafasi ya kuumia.

English	Boda boda's are a very risky form of transportation. Make sure to wear your helmet to prevent injury.
Swahili	Usafiri wa bodaboda ni hatari sana. Hakikisha unavaa helmeti kuzuia hatari.

English	The number of boda accidents increases every year. Make sure to wear your helmet.
Swahili	Idadi ya ajali za bodaboda zinaongezeka kila mwaka. Hakikisha unavaa helmeta yako.

Source: Amend study

English	You are more likely to have serious head injuries if you get in an accident without a helmet.
Swahili	Unauwezekano mkubwa wa kupata majeraha ya kichwa wakati wa ajali kama usipokuwa na helmeta.

### **Control:**

English	This is a short reminder to not speed while driving your boda.
Swahili	Hii ni kuku-kumbusha kuwa usiendeshe bodaboda yako kwa mwendo kasi.

English	This is a short reminder to follow traffic signs while driving your boda.
Swahili	Hii ni kuku-kumbusha kufuata alama za barabarani wakati unaendesha bodaboda yako.

English	This is a short reminder to make sure your passengers are safe on your boda boda.
Swahili	Hii ni kuku-kumbusha kuhakikisha kuwa abiria wako wapo salama kwenye bodaboda yako.



### CHAPTER III

#### The Effect on Cesarean Section Rates of an SMS Based Educational Intervention for Pregnant Women in Xi'an China

##### ABSTRACT:

**Objective:** Given China's extremely high caesarean section delivery rate (up to 54.9%), the purpose of this study is to evaluate the impact of different informational text messages (SMS) informational messages regarding prenatal health and delivery mode on rates of caesarean section delivery in the study population.

**Design:** A quasi- randomized controlled trial was conducted to measure the impact of different types of SMS messages on self-reported mode of delivery. Assignment was based on whether each woman's month and day of birth was odd-odd, odd-even, even-odd, or even-even.

**Intervention:** Participants were assigned into one of four groups, each receiving a different set of messages, including 1) a comparison group that received only a few "basic" messages, 2) a group receiving messages primarily regarding care-seeking, 3) a group receiving messages primarily regarding good home prenatal practices, and 4) a group receiving all text messages. These messages were delivered throughout pregnancy and were tailored to the woman's gestational week. The "Basic" message group was sent no messages regarding mode of delivery. The "Care Seeking" message group was sent seven relevant messages, generally focusing on describing proper indications for caesarean, and cautions regarding risks of caesareans. The "Home Practices" group received fifteen relevant messages, generally focusing on inspiring confidence in vaginal delivery and discussing non-anesthetic ways to reduce and cope with pain

during delivery. The “All Texts” group was sent all texts in both the “Care Seeking” and “Home Practices” groups.

**Main Outcome Measure:** The proportion of women in each group that reported delivering their child via caesarean section.

**Results:** In the unadjusted analysis, neither the care-seeking or good home prenatal practices texts alone were associated with lowered odds of undergoing caesarean section. The group receiving both sets of texts was associated with an odds ratio (OR) of 0.78,  $p=.085$ . However, looking at the subset of women who reported actually receiving program text messages paints a different picture. Care seeking messages alone were associated with an odds ration of 0.71 ( $p=.045$ ). The group getting All Texts (Care Seeking & Home Practices together) was associated with reduced odds of undergoing caesarean section (OR = 0.65,  $p=0.008$ ). Adjusting for potentially confounding covariates in the full set of observations shows that the group with all texts sent together is associated with an a odds ratio of 0.74,  $p=.058$ . Focusing on the subset of women who actually received program text messages, adjusting shows care-seeking messages to be associated with an odds ratio of 0.64,  $p=.017$ , and the message group receiving all texts was associated with a highly significant OR of 0.59,  $p=0.004$ .

## **Background & Introduction**

Since 1985, the global healthcare community has estimated that regional caesarean section rates should not exceed between 10% and 15% (Vogel et al., 2015; World Health Organization, 2015). However, in the People's Republic of China (PRC), the rate of caesarean section delivery is much higher. Based on a survey by the World Health Organization (WHO) on methods of delivery during the period 2007-8, caesarean sections in Asia as a whole were estimated to be comprise 27% of all deliveries. But in China, the rate was 46.2%, the highest of any country in the WHO's Global Survey (WHOGS) (Lumbiganon et al., 2010). It is estimated that between 1990 and 2014 China has had an average annual rate of increase in caesarean section rates of about 10% (Betrán et al., 2016).

In certain situations, caesarean sections can be life-saving interventions. Many studies confirm that they have a strongly protective effect on perinatal mortality when breech presentations are encountered. (Lumbiganon et al., 2010; Villar et al., 2007). Villar and colleagues state "It is clear that these babies, regardless of gestational age, should be delivered by planned caesarean" (Villar et al., 2007).

There can also be other benefits. In a 2006 systematic review conducted by Visco and colleagues, eleven studies provided moderate strength of evidence showing a lower risk of hemorrhage and blood transfusion in planned cesareans than in vaginal delivery, and nine articles (from eight studies) provided weak evidence that rates of stress urinary incontinence for planned "elective" cesarean section were either lower than or no different from those for vaginal

delivery” (Visco et al., 2006). In a 2015 study of 66,226 deliveries over six years in the largest obstetric center in Shanghai found that compared to vaginal delivery, caesarean delivery was associated with a reduction in antepartum stillbirth, brachial plexus injuries related to shoulder dystocia, bone trauma to the clavicle, skull or humerus, intracranial hemorrhage, and neonatal hypoxemic encephalopathy (Liu et al., 2015).

Moreover, in their review, Visco and colleagues found four studies suggesting no evidence of difference in maternal mortality associated with planned vaginal versus planned cesarean delivery” (Visco et al., 2006). In the WHO’s Global Survey of delivery mode, the maternal mortality risk for antepartum caesarean section without indication could not be estimated because there were no maternal deaths in that group (Lumbiganon et al., 2010).

However, these protective effects come with serious risks in other outcomes. Using data from the WHOOGS, Souza et al. found that though its association with maternal mortality was either insignificant or inestimable, both antepartum and intrapartum caesarean sections without medical indications for necessary caesareans were found to have strong associations with severe maternal morbidity. Putting death and several severe morbidities into one “Severe Maternal Outcomes” index, the authors found antepartum caesarean section with no medical indications to have an adjusted odds ratio (OR) of 5.93 for qualifying for the index, and intrapartum caesarean section without medical indications had an adjusted OR of 14.29, both with  $p < .05$ . (Souza et al., 2010). A large cohort study in Australia found that mothers delivering via caesarean were more likely to be readmitted to the hospital within 8 weeks of birth (Thompson et al., 2002).

Besides immediate concerns, caesarean sections can be associated with important problems in the future. A recent study from Australia found that women delivering via caesarean had roughly twice the odds of persistent pain one year after delivery (Kainu et al., 2010). The association between caesarean section and reduced future fertility has been demonstrated in a number of epidemiologic studies (Gilliam, 2006). Given a new conception, a prior caesarean delivery may cause an increased risk of fetal wastage, and there is data linking previous caesarean delivery to unexplained stillbirth in the subsequent pregnancy (Gilliam, 2006; Visco et al., 2006). Further, there is a strong body of evidence on impaired uterine function following caesarean delivery relating to abnormal placentation. Additionally, caesarean delivery is associated with poor scar integrity during subsequent pregnancy manifested as uterine scar dehiscence and, in some cases, uterine rupture (Gilliam, 2006). Given that China has taken several steps in recent years to relax the constraints of their one child policy, the effect of caesarean delivery on future pregnancies are now much more relevant in the PRC.

Overall, given the above risks and benefits, the WHO has concluded that:

*“Caesarean Sections are effective in saving maternal and infant lives, but only when they are required for medically indicated reasons. ... Caesarean sections can cause significant and sometimes permanent complications, disability or death particularly in settings that lack the facilities and/or capacity to properly conduct safe surgery and treat surgical complications. Caesarean sections should ideally only be undertaken when medically necessary.” (WHO 2015)*

Many of the caesarean sections occurring in China are not medically necessary. Lumbiganaon and colleagues estimated that with 11.7% of all deliveries in China during the study period were

caesarean sections without any medical indications (Lumbiganon et al., 2010). Combining the 24 countries in the WHO's Global Survey on methods of delivery, it was estimated that 63% of all caesarean sections without medical indications were performed in Chinese health facilities (Souza et al., 2010).

A more recent national estimate by Liu et al. paints an even more striking picture. In their multi-centre survey of 39 hospitals in 14 provinces in China, the overall rate of caesarean delivery in mainland China was 54.90% (Liu et al., 2014). The authors found that an important driver of this figure was that women with no indications necessitating a caesarean delivery were frequently requesting caesareans anyway. Caesarean delivery on maternal request (CDMR) accounted for 15.53% of all the deliveries and 28.43% of all caesarean section deliveries their multi-centre survey (Liu et al., 2014). This national estimate confirms what at least 11 other smaller & qualitative studies (Feng et al., 2014) and at least one regional estimate (Zhang et al., 2008) have suggested: women's own choices are part of the rise in China's caesarean section rates.

China's "One-Child Policy" has likely played a role in this preference. As early as 1989 the indication "precious child" was increasingly found reported amongst conventional clinical factors justifying caesarean delivery (Feng et al., 2014). This term generally connotes that both the parents are single children in their immediate families (Zhang et al., 2008). Families often desire a perfect baby, and are greatly adverse to risks (Zhang et al., 2008). "Precious child," and its even more vague successor "social factors" have risen to be the most common justification in some hospitals (Feng et al., 2014).

In addition, women nowadays often view caesarean sections as protecting themselves. In a 2006 survey conducted in two rural counties of Anhui province, more than 80% of women reporting electing caesarean section gave two main reasons: fear of pain, and because caesareans were considered safer for the baby and themselves. Less common reasons were pregnancy or labor complications, possibility of having tubal ligation at the same time, and being able to select a specific day for delivery. (C.-M. Huang et al., 2013). Qualitative evidence indicates that convenience, perceived safety, painless birth, and choice of birth date are all factors in women electing to have a caesarean section (Feng et al., 2014; C.-M. Huang et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2014). Choosing a specific birth date can be motivational because some dates are considered more auspicious (Mi and Liu, 2014; Zhang et al., 2008). Also, some women believe their child will be more clever if their head is not forced through the birth canal (Feng et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2008). It's worth noting that impact of women's preferences for caesarean could be modified by physician amenability to patient requests. Evidence exists that physicians in rural China sometimes prescribe and even change prescription behavior in accordance with patient demand, and that patient behavior during seeking care can influence prescribing by the providers (Dong, 2003).

There is also evidence that an important portion of the "demand" for caesareans is supplier induced (C.-M. Huang et al., 2013). Caesarean sections bring in approximately twice the hospital revenue per birth that vaginal deliveries do (Mi and Liu, 2014; Zhang et al., 2008). The power imbalance between patients and providers may mask the true decision making (Feng et al., 2014), and some researchers argued that women's role in decision making was less than that described by professionals (C.-M. Huang et al., 2013). For example, in a recent study conducted

in two hospitals in Shanghai, of 599 women interviewed in their third trimester, 17.0% reported preferring caesarean delivery. Yet of 523 women completing the study, 58.1% underwent caesarean section. Of those, 50.0% had clinically accepted indications for a caesarean; the other half either had no indications at all (15.1%) and were assumed to be based on maternal request, or had “doctor-defined” indications (34.9%) such as gestational hypertension or heavy fetus, which did not conform to the national guidelines for caesarean delivery (Ji et al., 2015). It was also noted by Huang et al. in their survey in Anhui province that women with private sector obstetricians show consistently higher caesarean delivery rates than those in the public sector, which the authors argue could not be explained simply by women’s preferences. They also point to qualitative data indicating that the “physician factor,” which includes their training, experience, personal preferences, and financial considerations, is an important influence on the uptake of caesarean section for delivery. Therefore, educating and empowering women to refute inappropriate doctor recommendations for caesarean delivery may be as important a pathway for reducing caesarean deliveries as changing women’s underlying preferences.

While there is a lack of clarity on the extent to which it is supplier induced or originates with the women themselves, there is agreement that the rate of caesarean delivery in the PRC is excessive, and numerous experts are beginning to call for strategies to reduce caesarean section use in China, most specifically when requested by women without any medical indication. To quote a few:



*“Therefore, implementation of evidence-based strategies to avoid medically unnecessary primary caesarean section, and to encourage the safe and appropriate use of vaginal birth after caesarean section, is needed.” (Vogel et al., 2015)*

*“Therefore, to reduce the rate of [caesarean sections], we should try to reduce the rate of CDMR. This means that the perception of women and their families that [caesarean delivery] is the safest and most convenient way for childbirth needs to be changed.” (Liu et al., 2014)*

*“Concerted action targeting service providers as well as users needs to be taken in the near future, in order to effectively control the rapid rise of [caesarean delivery] in China.” (Ji et al., 2015)*

As discussed in Chapter I, Mobile Health (mHealth) generally, and the use of text messaging specifically, are expanding topics of study that have already shown significant effects in several intervention areas. However, evidence for or against its efficacy in the field of maternal and child health is scarce (Noordam et al., 2011; Tamrat and Kachnowski, 2012), and larger scale evaluations of its possible effects on maternal health behaviors and health outcomes are warranted (Evans et al., 2012; Jareethum et al., 2008; Lund et al., 2012; Naughton et al., 2013). To date, systematic literature reviews have found no published studies exploring either the use of text messaging for maternal health promotion in China nor the use of text messaging to influence choice of delivery mode anywhere. A detailed review of the literature that does exist related to mHealth and health behaviors can be found in Chapter I of this thesis.

This study comprises a portion of Evaluation for mHealth Interventions (EMI) Newborn Health Project. The Newborn Health Project has several aims; its primary (trial registered) metric of success being the newborn's appropriate weight for gestational age. This paper will investigate whether the short message service (SMS) advice provided by the Newborn Health Project was successful in a secondary goal of lowering the rates of cesarean delivery in the intervention arms.

## **Methods**

The Newborn Health project offers expectant mothers in the rural district of Gaoling in Xi'an, China a package of free, short, informational messages via cell phone regarding pregnancy and childbirth. These messages are delivered throughout the pregnancy and are tailored to each mother's gestational week. It is hypothesized that delivering these messages to pregnant women can improve maternal and newborn health. The study utilizes factorial quasi-randomization at the individual level to assign women to receive one of four groups of text messages, then compares psychological, behavioral and health outcomes between the four groups. Quasi-randomization assigned treatment based on the expecting mother's birthday, specifically whether their birth month and day of birth were even-even, even-odd, odd-even, or odd-odd. This assignment method was successful at balancing observable covariates, as discussed in detail in the Statistical Analysis & Results section.

The four study arms include: 1) Good household prenatal practice messages (Home Practices), including advice on nutrition, exercise, self-awareness of depression, breastfeeding, etc.; 2) Care seeking messages (Care Seeking), which include information about government-subsidized

programs, warning signs of potential problems, and the importance of care seeking during illness; 3) Both types of messaging (All Texts); and 4) A very limited (25 in total) set of “Basic” messages about pregnancy to act as a comparison group. Women in the other intervention arms also received all of these basic messages. From an estimation standpoint, to act as a valid comparison group for the *content* of intervention texts, it was decided that the comparison group should receive at least some regular informational placebo messages to feel like they received a service and were part of the program. From an ethical standpoint, it also ensured that all enrollees received the most basic pregnancy information; the informational equivalent of “basic care.” These basic, placebo messages included primarily un-actionable updates on fetal development in different gestational stages, as well as a handful of reminders for prenatal visits and promotion of certified skilled attendance of labor. Thus, group comparisons of treatment arms elicit the effect of (assignment to) receiving the content in the more comprehensive intervention messages in addition to the basic ones, and are designed intentionally to estimate this effect separated out from the effect of being included in an informational messaging study at all. Totally, 148 messages have been designed in this study, and the number of messages by topic and study arm is presented in Appendix 3.1.

The four treatment arms received differing sets of messages relevant to labor and delivery that could potentially impact a woman’s choice in mode of delivery. As a first of its kind, this intervention is exploratory in investigating what combination of SMS messages are most efficacious in promoting vaginal delivery. Of the “Basic” (comparison) group’s 25 messages, none were relevant to mode of delivery. Of the 82 messages sent to the “Care Seeking” group, seven were relevant, generally focusing on describing proper indications for caesarean, and

cautioning that caesareans and anesthesia make birth less painful but come with other risks. These texts can help women recognize when caesareans are actually indicated and not indicated, and instill a hesitance to undergo a caesarean. Of their total 91 messages, the “Home Practices” group was sent fifteen delivery relevant ones, generally focusing on inspiring confidence in vaginal delivery and discussing non-anesthetic ways to reduce and cope with pain during delivery. These can potentially allay some of the fear of pain from undergoing vaginal delivery, which as mentioned is a key driver of CDMR. The “All Texts” group received 22 relevant messages out of their total 148, composed of all messages sent to the other treatment arms. The exact messages sent relevant to labor and delivery are presented in Appendix 3.2. It should be noted that though presented in English here, the messages that women receive were actually in Mandarin.

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the School of Medicine at Xi’an Jiao Tong University on January 18th, 2013. Upon agreement with the Xi’an Health Bureau in Shanxi Province, China, Gaoling district was selected as the intervention site, and the local maternal and child health center (MCHC) was invited to be the study site. All women attending their first visit to the antenatal care (ANC) at the MCHC during the study period were invited to participate, so long as they were aged 18-45 years old and had access to a cellular phone owned by themselves or someone in the same household. All participants so recruited were presented with and signed an informed consent form.

Between July and August 2013, 20 local public health professionals and 4 student researchers were trained regarding the consent process, cognitive debriefing, face-to-face interviewing, and

phone interviewing. Pilot testing with 140 subjects occurred between August – October 2013, and was comprehensive of recruitment, treatment assignment, sending (abbreviated) message sets, and collecting information on all survey instruments. Survey questionnaires were finalized after incorporating feedback from the testing.

Prior to treatment assignment, a baseline survey was conducted with each enrollee. This survey collected demographic data, self-reported health data, as well as data relating to each enrollees' thoughts and perceptions regarding health during pregnancy and childbirth.

Next, a quasi-randomized factorial assignment placed each participant into one of four possible message package programs. Neither the health workers who enrolled the participants nor the participants themselves were informed how treatment would be assigned.

The intervention's text messages were sent from the first clinic visit until delivery, and the contents are tailored according to the women's gestational week. A week after each delivery, a follow-up survey was conducted via phone, measuring knowledge, psychological and behavioral changes, as well as other pregnancy related questions, including whether the delivery was vaginal or via caesarean section. Additionally, the survey asked whether the enrollee had successfully received our messages; if so, how approximately how many; as well as their levels of satisfaction and perceived usefulness of various aspects of and topics included in the messages.

## Statistical Analysis & Results

Prior to analysis, two balance checks were run on all variables collected in the baseline survey. The first balance check was conducted using all women who were enrolled in the study and completed a baseline survey. These results are presented in Table 3.1A below. The second balance test of baseline variables included only those women who completed the study and the follow-up survey. These results are presented in Table 3.1B below. For continuous and ordinal variables, one-way ANOVAs were performed to determine if there existed a distribution imbalance across the four treatment arms. For categorical variables, chi-squared tests were performed to check for balance across treatment arms. In total, 56 baseline variables were analyzed in each balance check.

If all null hypotheses of no association truly held, meaning treatment assignment was orthogonal to all covariates, at a significance threshold of  $\alpha = .05$ , we would still expect 5% of independent tests to result in the Type I error of falsely rejecting the null hypothesis of no association. Thus, of 56 balance tests, we would expect to erroneously reject the null hypothesis for 2.8. We would further expect another 2.8 balance tests to erroneously reject the null hypothesis of no association at  $.05 < p < .10$ , for a total of 5.6. We found that for the set of women completing the study, only one baseline variable test rejected balance at  $p < .05$ , and a further 4 to reject balance at  $.05 < p < .10$ , for a total of 5. Balance in the set of all women completing a baseline survey found only one of 56 tests to reject balance at  $p < .05$ , and only two more to reject balance at  $p < .10$ . Finding no more significant associations than would be expected when treatment assignment is

genuinely orthogonal to all covariates, we inferred that our quasi-randomization was effective in assigning treatment orthogonally to relevant observable covariates.

A pure randomization assignment method would have the same goal of distributing treatment orthogonally to covariates, and subsequent a subsequent balance check would have the same number of expected Type I errors. Achieving the same standard, we infer that our quasi-randomization worked as effectively at balancing observable covariates as a successful pure randomization is meant to be in expectation. As always, is unknowable whether unobservable covariates were also well balanced, and unobserved unbalanced confounders may still bias our results. However, this is always true, and study designs with both random and non-random assignments proceed after successful balance checks on observable covariates under the untestable assumption that unobservable covariates are balanced to the same degree as observable ones.

**TABLE 3.1A: Balance Check, All Baseline Variables, All Enrollees**

	<b>Basic</b> N=1,057	<b>Care Seeking</b> N=1,106	<b>Home Practices</b> N=1,044	<b>All Texts</b> N=1,168		
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean (SD) Or % in Category</b>				<b>Test</b>	<b>P Value</b>
Age (years)	26.9 (4.0)	26.9 (3.9)	26.9 (3.8)	27.1 (3.9)	Anova	0.518
Weight before Pregnancy (lbs)	120.2 (18.2)	119.8 (17.6)	120.5 (18.3)	120.8 (18.0)	Anova	0.591
Han / Minority	99.3%	99.2%	99.2%	98.6%	Chi-2	0.284
RESIDENCY						
Province/City	2.4%	2.8%	2.5%	3.8%	Chi-2	0.156
County	13.6%	15.3%	16.0%	14.0%		
Township	21.4%	17.7%	17.5%	18.0%		
Village	62.6%	64.3%	64.1%	64.3%		

**TABLE 3.1A (Continued)**

OCCUPATON						
Farmer	20.6%	19.4%	21.1%	19.5%	Chi-2	0.833
Business Owner	7.5%	7.5%	6.6%	7.3%		
Government Worker	3.7%	4.3%	4.7%	4.0%		
Migrant Worker	6.5%	7.6%	6.7%	6.9%		
Local Worker	4.1%	5.1%	5.9%	5.4%		
Home-Maker	37.0%	36.8%	33.1%	36.8%		
Other	20.6%	19.4%	21.9%	20.2%		
EDUCATION						
Jr. High or Less	45.6%	43.1%	40.0%	42.0%	Chi-2	0.396
Sr. High Graduate	27.8%	27.8%	30.9%	28.0%		
3yr College	19.6%	21.3%	21.4%	21.3%		
4yr College +	7.0%	7.8%	7.7%	8.7%		
Cell Phone Self Owned	91.9%	90.9%	92.0%	92.2%	Chi-2	0.681
HUSBAND EDUCATION						
Jr. High or Less	44.2%	42.5%	42.8%	43.5%	Chi-2	0.696
Sr. High Graduate	29.7%	29.7%	27.3%	27.7%		
3yr College	18.1%	19.3%	20.4%	19.0%		
4yr College +	8.1%	8.4%	9.5%	9.9%		
INSURANCE						
NCMS	78.0%	77.1%	76.3%	77.1%	Chi-2	0.767
Urban Worker	5.7%	7.2%	7.0%	7.2%		
Urban Resident	9.7%	8.4%	8.4%	8.6%		
Other	2.3%	2.3%	2.6%	1.7%		
None	4.3%	5.0%	5.7%	5.5%		
Currently Married	98.7%	98.5%	98.6%	98.1%	Chi-2	0.714
Family Members in Household	4.3 (1.3)	4.2 (1.3)	4.3 (1.3)	4.3 (1.3)	Anova	0.770
Annual Household Expenditure (RMB)	33,900 (45,200)	32,500 (37,000)	33,500 (34,800)	34,200 (46,200)	Anova	0.903
Annual Household Income (RMB)	57,700 (74,300)	56,000 (73,400)	71,400 (235,800)	56,300 (56,500)	Anova	0.138
Economic Condition (Scale of 1-10)	5.8 (2.0)	5.6 (1.8)	5.7 (1.9)	5.7 (1.9)	Anova	0.524
PREGNANCY NUMBER						
1st	42.5%	43.2%	43.9%	42.4%	Chi-2	0.974
2nd	35.6%	35.0%	33.8%	35.9%		
3rd +	21.9%	21.8%	22.4%	21.8%		
PREVIOUS LIVE BIRTHS						
None	64.1%	65.1%	64.8%	63.5%	Chi-2	0.730
One	34.9%	33.6%	34.5%	35.7%		
Two +	1.1%	1.3%	0.7%	0.8%		



**TABLE 3.1A (Continued)**

PREVIOUS MISCARRIAGES						
None	56.7%	55.9%	57.1%	57.4%	Chi-2	0.997
One	30.2%	31.7%	30.1%	30.5%		
Two +	12.2%	12.4%	12.9%	12.2%		
Previous Delivery Method <sup>a</sup> (if has children)						
Vaginal	17.0%	21.2%	21.6%	22.6%	Chi-2	0.232
Caesarean	83.0%	78.9%	78.4%	77.4%		
Previous Child Gender <sup>a</sup>						
Female	66.5%	62.7%	65.4%	62.3%	Chi-2	0.827
Male	36.5%	37.3%	34.6%	37.7%		
Previous Child's Age <sup>a</sup>						
	5.8 (3.6)	6.0 (3.6)	5.8 (3.6)	6.1 (3.5)	Anova	0.685
Previous Duration of Breastfeeding <sup>a</sup> (mo)						
	7.7 (4.8)	8.1 (4.7)	8.2 (4.7)	8.3 (4.8)	Anova	0.397
Health Condition Before Pregnancy						
Very Good	8.4%	7.6%	7.5%	8.5%	Chi-2	0.253
Good	46.3%	49.4%	50.3%	49.7%		
Fair	43.5%	41.3%	41.3%	39.5%		
Poor	1.9%	1.8%	0.9%	2.3%		
Health Compared to Before Pregnancy						
Better	3.9%	4.7%	5.1%	3.7%	Chi-2	0.039 **
Same	62.2%	59.6%	65.5%	63.9%		
Worse	22.0%	23.9%	17.8%	19.7%		
Don't Know	12.0%	11.8%	11.6%	12.7%		
CURRENT SMOKER						
No	98.5%	99.2%	99.0%	98.5%	Chi-2	0.330
Yes	1.6%	0.8%	1.0%	1.5%		
HUSBAND SMOKE						
Yes, Current	56.7%	56.5%	51.2%	55.8%	Chi-2	0.037
No	33.9%	37.1%	43.6%	37.8%		
Former	6.4%	6.4%	5.2%	6.4%		
CURRENT DRINKER						
No	99.0%	98.1%	98.8%	98.4%	Chi-2	0.304
Yes	1.0%	1.9%	1.2%	1.6%		
HUSBAND DRINK						
Yes, Current	21.3%	20.1%	20.2%	19.4%	Chi-2	0.707
No	69.1%	71.6%	71.6%	71.0%		
Former	9.5%	8.3%	8.2%	9.6%		

**TABLE 3.1A (Continued)**

EXERCISE						
Yes, Current	34.3%	32.8%	34.1%	32.2%	Chi-2	0.736
No	55.6%	55.7%	54.1%	56.6%		
Former	10.1%	11.6%	11.9%	11.3%		
EXERCISE HUSBAND						
Yes, Current	38.3%	39.5%	41.3%	39.2%	Chi-2	0.765
No	54.7%	53.8%	53.1%	53.8%		
Former	7.0%	6.8%	5.7%	7.1%		
HEALTH INFORMATION SOURCES						
Uses Health Institution	11.5%	11.9%	11.4%	13.5%	Chi-2	0.436
Uses Internet	44.1%	43.5%	43.3%	45.8%	Chi-2	0.621
Uses TV	7.9%	7.7%	8.0%	8.4%	Chi-2	0.961
Uses Books	24.5%	24.3%	27.7%	24.1%	Chi-2	0.202
Uses Friends	32.9%	34.4%	33.6%	32.9%	Chi-2	0.869
Uses Family Members	15.1%	13.4%	15.0%	14.9%	Chi-2	0.655
No Sources	4.5%	4.0%	4.3%	4.6%	Chi-2	0.896
Uses Other Sources	2.6%	1.8%	1.8%	1.4%	Chi-2	0.264
Pregnancy Week at Sign-up	14.7 (7.2)	15.1 (7.3)	14.9 (7.1)	14.9 (7.5)	Chi-2	0.763
PREGNANCY PLANNED						
Yes	63.8%	66.2%	66.6%	65.9%	Chi-2	0.558
No	36.2%	33.8%	33.4%	34.1%		
SINGLETON						
Singleton	85.7%	85.8%	86.2%	85.6%	Chi-2	0.827
Twins & Above	0.6%	1.2%	1.2%	1.0%		
Not Sure	13.7%	13.1%	12.6%	13.4%		
Health Attitudes <sup>b</sup> (1-5)	3.89 (1.0)	3.93 (.97)	3.91 (1.0)	3.94 (.94)	Anova	0.559
Health Expectations <sup>b</sup> (1-5)	3.78 (.71)	3.80 (.73)	3.78 (.71)	3.81 (.72)	Anova	0.506
Health Self Efficacy <sup>b</sup> (1-5)	3.13 (.91)	3.13 (.91)	3.12 (.90)	3.11 (.90)	Anova	0.963

**TABLE 3.1B: Balance Check, All Baseline Variables, Women With Follow-Up Surveys**

	Basic N = 488	Care Seeking N = 471	Home Practices N = 465	All Texts N = 528		
Variable	Mean (SD)	Or % in Category			Test	P Value
Age (years)	26.7 (3.7)	27.0 (4.0)	27.0 (3.9)	27.0 (3.7)	Anova	0.648
Weight before Pregnancy (lbs)	120.0 (17.7)	119.5 (18.2)	120.1 (18.3)	120.1 (18.1)	Anova	0.958
Han / Minority	99.6%	99.8%	99.4%	98.9%	Chi-2	0.272
RESIDENCY						
Province/City	1.9%	2.6%	1.6%	3.3%	Chi-2	0.085    *
County	7.0%	8.7%	8.4%	10.0%		
Township	22.0%	17.6%	15.3%	15.4%		
Village	69.1%	71.2%	74.7%	71.2%		
OCCUPATON						
Farmer	22.5%	21.2%	24.7%	22.0%	Chi-2	0.972
Business Owner	5.9%	6.6%	5.8%	6.2%		
Government Worker	2.8%	2.7%	2.7%	1.9%		
Migrant Worker	5.7%	6.6%	4.5%	5.2%		
Local Worker	3.6%	4.0%	3.8%	4.8%		
Home-Maker	38.8%	39.7%	38.1%	36.5%		
Other	20.8%	19.2%	20.4%	23.4%		
EDUCATION						
Jr. High or Less	47.4%	44.5%	42.3%	41.4%	Chi-2	0.675
Sr. High Graduate	30.2%	30.6%	32.7%	30.9%		
3yr College	16.8%	20.0%	19.3%	22.0%		
4yr College +	5.6%	5.0%	5.7%	5.7%		
Cell Phone Self Owned	93.5%	92.3%	91.9%	92.4%	Chi-2	0.803
HUSBAND EDUCATION						
Jr. High or Less	43.8%	44.2%	47.7%	443.3%	Chi-2	0.513
Sr. High Graduate	35.0%	32.9%	27.6%	31.7%		
3yr College	14.2%	16.2%	17.1%	17.9%		
4yr College +	7.1%	6.7%	7.7%	7.1%		
INSURANCE						
NCMS	81.8%	82.2%	81.1%	82.1%	Chi-2	0.652
Urban Worker	3.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.3%		
Urban Resident	8.6%	8.8%	7.3%	7.5%		
Other	2.7%	2.3%	2.3%	1.4%		
None	3.8%	2.8%	5.7%	5.7%		
Currently Married	98.8%	98.5%	99.1%	99.2%	Chi-2	0.658
Family Members in Household	4.4 (1.2)	4.4 (1.2)	4.3 (1.2)	4.4 (1.2)	Anova	0.408
Annual Household Expenditure (RMB)	33,600 (55,900)	31,200 (27,500)	31,900 (27,500)	33,700 (39,100)	Anova	0.883

**TABLE 3.1B (Continued):**

Annual Household Income (RMB)	50,400 (48,200)	58,000 (89,400)	54,900 (48,400)	54,900 (52,100)	Anova	0.586
Economic Condition (Scale of 1-10)	5.8 (1.9)	5.7 (1.9)	5.7 (2.0)	5.6 (2.0)	Anova	0.375
PREGNANCY NUMBER						
1st	42.5%	42.2%	42.1%	42.2%	Chi-2	0.928
2nd	36.9%	34.4%	34.2%	34.9%		
3rd +	20.6%	23.4%	23.8%	22.9%		
PREVIOUS LIVE BIRTHS						
None	62.9%	61.2%	63.9%	63.3%	Chi-2	0.808
One	36.5%	38.0%	35.8%	35.7%		
Two +	0.6%	0.9%	0.2%	1.0%		
PREVIOUS MISCARRIAGES						
None	60.8%	55.7%	54.1%	56.4%	Chi-2	0.266
One	29.0%	33.5%	31.6%	30.9%		
Two +	10.2%	10.9%	14.4%	12.7%		
Previous Delivery Method <sup>a</sup> (if has children)						
Vaginal	13.7%	19.8%	18.0%	19.9%	Chi-2	0.385
Caesarean	86.3%	80.2%	82.0%	80.1%		
Previous Child Gender <sup>a</sup>						
Female	62.9%	64.8%	66.7%	61.2%	Chi-2	0.733
Male	37.1%	35.2%	33.3%	38.8%		
Previous Child's Age <sup>a</sup>	5.6 (3.5)	5.8 (3.5)	6.0 (3.5)	6.1 (3.5)	Anova	0.608
Previous Duration of Breastfeeding <sup>a</sup> (mo)	7.8 (4.6)	8.0 (4.8)	8.4 (5.0)	8.2 (4.7)	Anova	0.678
Health Condition Before Pregnancy						
Very Good	8.3%	7.2%	7.1%	8.8%	Chi-2	0.879
Good	47.2%	50.2%	52.5%	49.8%		
Fair	43.0%	40.8%	38.8%	39.2%		
Poor	1.5%	1.8%	1.6%	2.2%		
Health Compared to Before Pregnancy						
Better	3.5%	4.9%	5.0%	4.3%	Chi-2	0.652
Same	61.9%	61.0%	66.4%	64.6%		
Worse	23.4%	22.3%	19.1%	19.7%		
Don't Know	11.2%	11.8%	10.6%	11.4%		
CURRENT SMOKER						
No	97.9%	99.1%	99.6%	98.8%	Chi-2	0.110
Yes	2.1%	0.9%	0.4%	1.2%		

**TABLE 3.1B (Continued):**

HUSBAND SMOKE						
Yes, Current	57.1%	60.8%	54.0%	57.8%	Chi-2	0.293
No	36.0%	33.6%	41.1%	36.1%		
Former	7.0%	5.7%	4.9%	6.2%		
CURRENT DRINKER						
No	99.6%	97.4%	98.7%	97.9%	Chi-2	0.041   **
Yes	0.4%	2.7%	1.3%	2.1%		
HUSBAND DRINK						
Yes, Current	22.0%	21.6%	21.7%	19.5%	Chi-2	0.229
No	67.0%	71.7%	70.5%	70.4%		
Former	11.0%	6.6%	7.8%	10.1%		
EXERCISE						
Yes, Current	34.5%	34.2%	32.8%	32.4%	Chi-2	0.968
No	55.3%	54.7%	55.8%	55.6%		
Former	10.2%	11.1%	11.4%	12.1%		
EXERCISE HUSBAND						
Yes, Current	38.4%	37.9%	38.6%	37.9%	Chi-2	0.117
No	53.9%	56.4%	57.6%	53.6%		
Former	7.6%	5.8%	3.8%	8.5%		
HEALTH INFORMATION SOURCES						
Uses Health Institution	10.3%	12.6%	10.2%	13.1%	Chi-2	0.379
Uses Internet	43.0%	43.1%	43.8%	45.5%	Chi-2	0.854
Uses TV	7.9%	7.2%	9.3%	7.7%	Chi-2	0.721
Uses Books	26.0%	27.0%	26.6%	25.0%	Chi-2	0.911
Uses Friends	33.6%	35.1%	36.2%	33.3%	Chi-2	0.784
Uses Family Members	15.0%	12.8%	14.4%	14.1%	Chi-2	0.832
No Sources	4.8%	4.9%	4.2%	4.5%	Chi-2	0.952
Uses Other Sources	2.2%	1.2%	1.4%	1.7%	Chi-2	0.651
Pregnancy Week at Sign-up	14.3 (7.0)	15.2 (7.3)	14.5 (7.0)	14.7 (7.0)	Chi-2	0.225
PREGNANCY PLANNED						
Yes	64.5%	66.4%	68.6%	66.9%	Chi-2	0.610
No	35.6%	33.6%	31.4%	33.1%		
SINGLETON						
Singleton	84.8%	84.9%	85.5%	86.0%	Chi-2	0.981
Twins & Above	0.9%	1.1%	1.4%	1.0%		
Not Sure	14.4%	14.0%	13.1%	13.0%		
Health Attitudes <sup>b</sup> (1-5)	3.88 (.98)	3.96 (.91)	4.03 (.89)	3.99 (.90)	Anova	0.063   *
Health Expectations <sup>b</sup> (1-5)	3.74 (.70)	3.82 (.69)	3.80 (.69)	3.84 (.68)	Anova	0.181
Health Self Efficacy <sup>b</sup> (1-5)	3.09 (.88)	3.07 (.93)	3.11 (.91)	3.14 (.91)	Anova	0.636

**TABLE 3.1B (Continued)**

Health Personal Norms <sup>b</sup> (1-5)	2.32 (1.1)	2.26 (1.1)	2.29 (1.0)	2.26 (1.1)	Anova	0.762	
Health Intentions <sup>b</sup> (1-5)	3.66 (.87)	3.62 (.98)	3.69 (.85)	3.73 (.88)	Anova	0.343	
Health Plans <sup>b</sup> (1-5)	2.52 (.90)	2.55 (.93)	2.56 (.93)	2.60 (.97)	Anova	0.650	
Health Susceptibility <sup>c</sup> (1-5, Don't Know=26.2%)	2.59 (1.46)	2.45 (1.38)	2.48 (1.39)	2.45 (1.41)	Anova & Chi-2	0.510 / .600	
Health Severity <sup>c</sup> (1-5, Don't Know = 40.3%)	2.52 (1.5)	2.50 (1.5)	2.5 (1.4)	2.3 (1.4)	Anova & Chi-2	0.454 / .815	
Health Social Norms <sup>c</sup> (1-5, Don't Know=18.6%)	3.70 (.86)	3.70 (.86)	3.84 (.70)	3.76 (.79)	Anova & Chi-2	0.058 / .330	*
PREFERRED GENDER FOR CHILD (FAMILY)							
Boy	8.3%	8.0%	8.1%	9.1%	Chi-2	0.845	
Girl	9.0%	8.7%	6.5%	8.1%			
No Preference	82.7%	83.4%	85.4%	82.8%			
PREFERRED GENDER FOR CHILD (SELF)							
Boy	8.4%	6.9%	6.8%	8.0%	Chi-2	0.081	*
Girl	23.3%	18.0%	20.7%	16.0%			
No Preference	68.3%	75.1%	72.5%	76.1%			
DELIVERY PREFERENCE							
Vaginal	83.8%	85.8%	85.2%	83.3%	Chi-2	0.824	
Caesarean	5.7%	6.4%	5.8%	6.4%			
Don't Know	10.4%	7.8%	9.0%	10.3%			
REASON PREFER CAESAREAN DELIVERY							
Vaginal is painful	24.3%	13.6%	18.8%	14.3%	Chi-2	0.341	
My friends choose it	0.0%	9.1%	12.5%	5.7%			
Doctors Suggested	54.1%	53.6%	50.0%	48.6%			
Other	21.6%	13.6%	18.8%	31.4%			

a = Asked only if respondent had previous children; % denote rates amongst this subset of women.

b = "Don't know" <7.5% of responses, "don't know" responses omitted.

c = "Don't Know" a common response, used both Anova & Chi-2 test for balance.

d = Asked only if respondent stated she preferred caesarean delivery; % denotes rates amongst this subset of women.

\* p < .10

\*\* p < .05

In total, 1,952 women of the original 4,375 from baseline completed a post-delivery follow-up survey which could be linked to her baseline survey. Of this, 488 (25.0%) were in the “Basic” messages group, 471 (24.1) were in the Care Seeking Messages treatment arm, 465 (23.8%) were in the Home Practices treatment arm, and 528 (27.0%) were in the group receiving All Texts. A chi-squared test shows no evidence of differential loss to follow-up by treatment arm, failing to reject the null of equal attrition at  $p=.615$ .

Loss to follow-up was high in our study for two main reasons. First, Gaoling MCHC with which this study partnered to implement the trial abruptly and without notice uniformly stopped sending program texts in December of 2015. Their decision was unrelated to efficacy, safety, or cost of the intervention. Rather, clinic management decided that future patient communications were preferably sent over WeChat than cellular SMS. WeChat is a very popular social networking app in China. Released in 2011, it is estimated to now have 1.1 billion accounts and 570 million daily users, predominantly in China, an estimated 55% of which open WeChat more than 10 times per day (“50+ Amazing WeChat Statistics,” 2014). While the content of the Newborn Health Projects SMS messages could easily be delivered unaltered over WeChat, the project’s setup linked message delivery to each women’s cellular number and no information on their potential WeChat accounts had been collected. Therefore, Gaoling MCHC simply stopped using the existing message delivery technology, and returned it.

A second reason for high attrition stemmed from difficulty in linking women’s baseline and follow-up observations. Using personal, identifiable information not accessible by this investigator, the implementation team linked women’s baseline and follow-up surveys first using

the woman's phone number reported on both the baseline and follow-up survey forms, and if this failed, the combination of their name and village. In up to 20% of cases, observations have either failed to link at all or failed to link uniquely. This investigator only has access to follow-up observations that have been successfully linked to baseline observations, and does not have IRB permissions to access to the necessary personal, identifiable information to either investigate or fix this issue.

It should be reiterated that there is no evidence that either issue caused attrition differentially across treatment arms. While certainly regrettable in terms of statistical power, a lack of correlation between attrition and treatment implies that there should be no bias induced in our experimental results by either factor contributing to our high attrition rate. That baseline covariates remained well and comparably balanced in both the final sample and the starting sample also indicates that bias was not likely to be introduced via attrition.

Before turning to our main topic, one striking implication of the baseline statistics is worth calling brief attention to. This Newborn Health Project only collected information on previous child gender and preferred gender for the current pregnancy as potential control variables in other analyses. Interestingly, though most stated that they had no preference, a *stated* preference for a girl was more than twice as common as a *stated* preference for a boy. However, in the gender distribution of women's previous children, girls outnumber boys almost two to one, specifically 63.4% to 36.6%. Application of Bayes' Theorem to these numbers shows an implicit stopping rule indicating an implicit preference for boys. The probability that women already have a girl given that they are having additional children  $P(G | A) = 0.634$ , by Bayes' Theorem,



is equal to the probability of having additional children given already having a girl  $P(A | G)$ , times the probability that any child is a girl  $P(G)$  and divided by the probability of having additional children given one existing child  $P(A)$ . The probability already having a boy given a new pregnancy  $P(B | A)$  can be analogously described. Assuming that biologically, any pregnancy is equally likely to result in male or female children ( $P_B \cong P_G \cong .50$ ), it can be easily shown that in our study population, the probability of having an additional child after having a girl is more likely than that of having an additional child after having a boy by a ratio of  $0.634/0.366 = 1.73$ . In light of China's very recently lifted one child policy, this might shine important light on which families can be anticipated to have more children in the near future.

Turning to our relationship of interest, the association of treatment assignment and caesarean section rates, the unadjusted rates of caesarean delivery by treatment assignment are presented below in Table 3.2.

**TABLE 3.2: Birth Method Rates By Treatment Assignment**

	<b>Caesarean</b>	<b>Vaginal</b>
<b>Basic</b>	133 (27.5%)	351 (72.5%)
<b>Care Seeking</b>	116 (24.9%)	350 (75.1%)
<b>Home Practices</b>	122 (26.4%)	340 (73.6%)
<b>All Texts</b>	119 (22.7%)	405 (77.3%)
<b>Total</b>	490 (25.3%)	1446 (74.7%)

Note that though the final sample contained 1,952 women, only 1,936 reported their mode of delivery. Indeed, some amount of missingness is to be expected in any large-scale survey, and no variable in the follow-up survey had a full 1,952 responses. By far the most common strategy to

handle missing data is to use “listwise deletion,” which means to drop any observation from the analysis that does not have an observed value for every variable in the analysis. However listwise deletion, under very weak assumptions, causes estimation errors of the same magnitude as the omitted variable bias that including (incompletely) observed variables is meant to correct (King et al., 2001). It’s been shown that a process called “multiple imputation” using expectation maximization is one that will generally outperform listwise deletion or the other most common general techniques of handling missing data (King et al., 2001). Multiple imputation was performed in R using the Amelia package. This process 16 imputed datasets that had “complete” data on all variables of interest. All regression analyses were run once on each of the 16 imputed datasets, and the results combined using Rubin’s technique for combining quantities of interest (King et al., 2001).

A total of four regression models were run to explore the impact of treatment on caesarean section rates. Models I & II are shown in Table 3.3. Model I is a simple unadjusted logistic regression that regressed the (log) odds of having a caesarean section on indicators for each intervention arm, with the Basic arm omitted as the base case. No control variables were included. The second model was the same functional form, but run on a subset of the data. As mentioned previously, one of the questions in the post-delivery survey was whether the enrollees had actually received text messages from the Newborn Health Project during their pregnancy. Surprisingly only 77.6% of respondents answered “Yes” to this question. The second regression model was the same unadjusted logistic regression as the first, run only on this 77.6% of respondents.

**Table 3.3: Unadjusted Logistic Regression of Caesarean Birth on Treatment Assignment**

Care Seeking Home Practices All Texts Constant	Model I: All Observations					Model II: "Got Texts" Subset (78%)				
	OR	95% CI	P Value		OR	95% CI	P Value			
	0.867	0.650	1.157	0.332		0.711	0.509	0.992	0.045 **	
	0.935	0.702	1.245	0.645		0.865	0.627	1.194	0.379	
	0.778	0.584	1.036	0.085 *		0.645	0.467	0.891	0.008 ***	
	0.384	0.314	0.468	0.000		0.434	0.347	0.542	0.000	

\* p < .10

\*\* p < .05

\*\*\* p < .01

It is unknown why over 22% of participants did not receive messages from the study. An array of nonexclusive possibilities include phone numbers being miswritten on the survey form, phone numbers being misentered into the SMS delivery system by health workers, participant phone numbers changing after enrollment, participants giving numbers besides their text-enabled cellular numbers as requested, or recall error. Also, over the full course of pregnancy, women were sent three reminders that they could opt out of further messaging by replying “stop” to program messages, though only 10 women in the study utilized this option, and all women using this option would have received at least one, if not many messages.

A subtle and potentially bias-creating possibility is that sending a very different number of messages to each group endogenously induced differential recall about receiving program texts. (See Appendix 3.1 for a breakdown of number of texts by treatment arm and topic). Fortunately, there is only very weak evidence for this. The rates of affirming text message receipt, by group, were: Basic – 76.6%, Care Seeking – 74.8%, Home Practices – 77.5%, and All Texts – 81.3%. A chi-squared test of equal proportions yielded a p-value of only 0.095. Notably, the Basic group, which was sent by far the fewest number of messages, had a proportion in between that of the Care Seeking and the Home Practices group. Also, the largest group difference in reported

message receipt was 6.4%, whereas each group had 18.7-25.2% non-receipt rate to account for. Therefore, focusing only on those who confirmed receiving texts would seem to generally exclude women who legitimately did not receive them while only potentially omitting a handful that received them but forgot due to differential recall. Analysis of all observations is the usual intent to treat (ITT) estimate for the experiment. Analysis of this subgroup is an approximation of the program's effect when all phone numbers are accurately conveyed by participants and utilized by health workers.

Models III & IV (displayed in Table 3.4 below) show the results of logistic regression of caesarean sections on intervention arm as well as baseline covariates. These baseline variables include general demographic information (age, education, income, residency), pregnancy history (previous live birth, previous miscarriage, whether pregnancy was planned or unplanned), baseline self-assessed health, baseline covariates known from the literature to be predictive of delivery mode (weight, insurance coverage, baseline desired mode of delivery)(K. Huang et al., 2013; Wispelwey and Sheiner, 2013), all covariates found to be unbalanced from the baseline balance check, and baseline measures of health psychology factors pulled from health behavior literature (Health Attitudes, Health Expectations, Health Self-Efficacy, Health Personal Pressure, Health Intentions, Health Plans, Perceived Health Social Norms, Perceived Susceptibility to Poor Health, and Perceived Severity of Potential Poor Health). The rationale behind the inclusion of these particular 9 measures is discussed in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

Only one variable from follow-up, "Family Support," was included given its noted associations with maternal health behaviors and neonatal health outcomes, which are discussed extensively in

Chapter 4 of this thesis. However, it is important to note that both unadjusted and covariate adjusted regressions (not shown) reveal that treatment has no effect on family support levels, meaning that family support is not a mediator of treatment, and the addition or removal of family support as a covariate in regressions of cesarean delivery on treatment assignment (also not shown) leaves the effect of treatment on the odds cesarean delivery unaltered in magnitude or significance. It is included here only so that adjusted regressions contain all potential major correlates of maternal health behavior, and so that regressions from Chapters III and IV may be directly comparable by interested readers.

**Table 3.4: Covariate-Adjusted Logistic Regression: Cesarean Birth on Treatment Group**

	Model III: All Observations					Model IV: "Got Texts" Subset (78%)				
	OR	95% CI	P Value			OR	95% CI	P Value		
<b>Care Seeking</b>	0.833	0.611	1.135	0.247		0.639	0.443	0.922	0.017	**
<b>Home Practices</b>	0.911	0.670	1.239	0.552		0.788	0.556	1.118	0.182	
<b>All Texts</b>	0.742	0.546	1.010	0.058	*	0.589	0.412	0.841	0.004	***
<b>Age (Centered)</b>	1.055	1.019	1.092	0.003	***	1.061	1.020	1.104	0.004	***
<b>Weight</b>										
<b>Centered</b>	1.011	1.004	1.017	0.002	***	1.007	0.999	1.015	0.081	*
<b>Planned Preg.</b>	1.009	0.791	1.287	0.943		1.031	0.779	1.364	0.831	
<b>Prev. Live Birth</b>	0.815	0.596	1.113	0.198		0.899	0.627	1.290	0.564	
<b>Past</b>										
<b>Miscarriage</b>	1.356	1.072	1.716	0.011	**	1.303	0.986	1.721	0.063	*
<b>Family Support</b>	1.140	0.902	1.439	0.273		1.201	0.920	1.567	0.178	
<b>Education: Jr.</b>										
<b>High - Omitted</b>										
<b>Sr. High</b>	1.069	0.808	1.415	0.640		1.229	0.886	1.703	0.216	
<b>3 Yr. College</b>	0.845	0.576	1.241	0.391		0.943	0.604	1.472	0.796	
<b>4 Yr. College +</b>	0.797	0.430	1.477	0.472		0.976	0.477	1.998	0.947	
<b>Husband</b>										
<b>Education</b>										
<b>Sr. High</b>	0.946	0.713	1.255	0.701		0.919	0.665	1.271	0.609	
<b>3 Yr. College</b>	1.123	0.761	1.659	0.558		1.125	0.727	1.743	0.597	
<b>4 Yr. College +</b>	1.018	0.585	1.771	0.950		1.084	0.568	2.069	0.807	

Table 3.4 (Continued):

<b>Insurance -</b>										
<b>NCMS omitted</b>										
<b>Urban Worker</b>	2.157	1.210	3.848	0.009	***	1.920	0.989	3.728	0.054	*
<b>Urban Resident</b>	0.891	0.570	1.392	0.611		0.943	0.572	1.554	0.818	
<b>Other</b>	0.838	0.371	1.889	0.669		0.851	0.327	2.216	0.741	
<b>None</b>	0.616	0.324	1.172	0.140		0.486	0.219	1.077	0.075	*
<b>Income</b>										
<b>Category:</b>										
<b>&lt;=22000 omitted</b>										
<b>22,001 RMB</b>	1.025	0.697	1.506	0.901		0.993	0.620	1.589	0.976	
<b>40,001 RMB</b>	1.061	0.692	1.627	0.786		1.047	0.643	1.704	0.854	
<b>65,001 RMB</b>	1.001	0.630	1.590	0.996		1.073	0.627	1.836	0.796	
<b>Health Baseline</b>										
<b>General:</b>										
<b>Health Attitude</b>	0.927	0.813	1.058	0.261		0.973	0.836	1.132	0.720	
<b>Health</b>										
<b>Expectations</b>	1.214	1.012	1.455	0.036	**	1.144	0.924	1.416	0.217	
<b>Health Self</b>										
<b>Efficacy</b>	1.024	0.892	1.175	0.734		1.017	0.868	1.191	0.835	
<b>Health Personal</b>										
<b>Pressure</b>	0.943	0.843	1.054	0.303		0.943	0.829	1.073	0.376	
<b>Health Intentions</b>	0.926	0.805	1.064	0.278		0.873	0.747	1.020	0.086	*
<b>Health Plans</b>	1.012	0.886	1.155	0.863		1.020	0.877	1.186	0.799	
<b>Health Perceived</b>										
<b>Susceptible-</b>										
<b>Severity</b>										
<b>Category</b>										
<b>2</b>	0.989	0.658	1.486	0.956		0.986	0.631	1.540	0.949	
<b>3</b>	1.330	0.817	2.166	0.251		0.905	0.487	1.680	0.751	
<b>4</b>	1.157	0.766	1.747	0.489		1.134	0.690	1.863	0.620	
<b>5</b>	1.320	0.869	2.004	0.193		1.104	0.683	1.785	0.685	
<b>6</b>	0.950	0.502	1.797	0.874		1.106	0.560	2.185	0.771	
<b>7</b>	1.150	0.713	1.856	0.566		1.162	0.693	1.948	0.570	
<b>8</b>	1.429	0.717	2.849	0.311		1.266	0.587	2.733	0.548	
<b>9</b>	1.367	0.944	1.980	0.098	*	1.266	0.842	1.903	0.256	
<b>Residency</b>										
<b>(Village Omitted)</b>										
<b>Province / City</b>	2.160	1.113	4.190	0.023	**	2.183	1.062	4.488	0.034	**
<b>County</b>	1.321	0.892	1.958	0.165		1.407	0.883	2.242	0.150	
<b>Township</b>	1.234	0.925	1.645	0.152		1.327	0.944	1.866	0.104	
<b>Health before</b>										
<b>Preg.: Very good</b>										
<b>Omitted</b>										
<b>Good</b>	0.905	0.595	1.376	0.639		0.992	0.594	1.656	0.975	
<b>Fair</b>	1.126	0.734	1.727	0.586		1.221	0.728	2.048	0.450	
<b>Poor</b>	1.392	0.570	3.396	0.468		1.869	0.729	4.795	0.193	

**Table 3.4 (Continued):**

<b>Social Norm: % Women, none omitted</b>										
<b>Some</b>	1.263	0.332	4.798	0.732		0.922	0.198	4.295	0.918	
<b>About Half</b>	1.512	0.406	5.632	0.538		0.856	0.188	3.892	0.840	
<b>Most</b>	1.608	0.446	5.804	0.468		1.105	0.252	4.856	0.894	
<b>Almost All</b>	1.624	0.426	6.196	0.477		1.193	0.255	5.570	0.823	
<b>Don't know</b>	1.392	0.384	5.052	0.615		0.947	0.214	4.199	0.943	
<b>Health Better</b>	1.159	0.676	1.984	0.592		1.064	0.566	2.003	0.847	
<b>Health Worse</b>	1.054	0.793	1.399	0.718		0.976	0.706	1.351	0.886	
<b>Health Not Sure</b>	0.658	0.447	0.971	0.035	**	0.532	0.333	0.849	0.008	***
<b>Prefer Boy</b>	0.887	0.577	1.364	0.585		1.003	0.613	1.643	0.990	
<b>Prefer Girl</b>	1.055	0.794	1.401	0.713		1.122	0.810	1.554	0.489	
<b>Husb. Not smoke</b>	1.055	0.829	1.344	0.662		1.120	0.843	1.487	0.435	
<b>Husb. Former</b>										
<b>Smoke</b>	1.271	0.802	2.016	0.308		1.290	0.752	2.214	0.356	
<b>Smoker</b>	1.498	0.565	3.966	0.416		1.867	0.586	5.947	0.291	
<b>Drinker</b>	0.641	0.249	1.649	0.356		0.641	0.198	2.072	0.457	
<b>Preferred Delivery: Vaginal Omitted</b>										
<b>C-Section</b>	3.749	2.481	5.664	0.000	***	4.386	2.709	7.103	0.000	***
<b>Don't Know</b>	2.151	1.514	3.056	0.000	***	2.137	1.421	3.212	0.000	***
<b>Constant</b>	0.124	0.024	0.630	0.012		0.224	0.035	1.432	0.114	

\* p < .10

\*\* p < .05

\*\*\* p < .01

In the unadjusted analysis, neither the “Care Seeking” messages group (which received five relevant messages focused on proper indications for caesarean, risks of anesthesia & caesarean sections) nor the “Home Practices” group (which received seven messages focusing on inspiring confidence in vaginal delivery and discussing non-anesthetic ways to reduce and cope with pain during delivery) were associated with a statistically significant reduction in the odds of undergoing caesarean section. In combination, the All Texts group was associated with an odds

ratio (OR) of 0.78, but a p value of .085. Looking at the subset of the 77.6% of women who actually received program text messages paints a different picture. In these women, Care Seeking messages alone were associated with an odds ratio of 0.71 with  $p=.045$ . The All Texts group was associated with a highly significant reduction in the odds of undergoing caesarean section (OR = 0.65,  $p=0.008$ ).

Adjusting for potentially confounding covariates as well as known and hypothesized predictors of caesarean delivery adds precision to these estimates but does not change them drastically. Using all observations, neither separate set of texts had a measureable association with reduced odds of caesarean sections, but sent together, the All Texts group was associated with an odds ratio of 0.74,  $p=.058$ . Focusing on the subset of women who actually received program text messages, adjusting for covariates shows Care Seeking messages alone to be associated with an strong odds ratio of 0.64,  $p=.017$ , and the All Texts group was associated with a highly significant OR of 0.59,  $p=0.004$ . Assuming the rate of 27.5% in the Basic group is representative of Gaoling, this odds ratio of caesarean section in the All Texts group would imply a potential 9.2 percentage point drop to 18.3% if all pregnant women in Gaoling received the messages in the All Texts arm.

## **Discussion**

The rate of caesarean section in the Basic group of our study (27.5%) is notably lower than two recent estimates of China's national average (46.2% & 54.9%). Nonetheless, a rate of 27.5% is still roughly double the WHO's recommended rate of 10-15%, and still merits improvement.



One possible reason for this lower than expected baseline is that both recent national surveys focused on large hospitals in large cities, whereas our sample came from an MCHC in a rural area. Tang and colleagues have noted that women in large cities have 2.4 times the odds of having caesarean delivery as women in smaller cities (Tang et al., 2006), a finding roughly in line with the odds ratio found in our study comparing women who self reported living in cities to those living in villages (OR=2.2). Further, Liu and colleagues found that caesarean section rates increased with hospital complexity, with tertiary care facilities having the highest rates (Liu et al., 2014). Also, we cannot test whether receiving the Basic messages lowered what would have been the baseline rate. However, given that no Basic messages discussed mode of delivery or related topics, any such effect is presumed to be small.

Evidence is strongly suggestive that receipt of the Newborn Health Project's full text message bank (All Texts) may have reduced women's likelihood of opting for a caesarean delivery. The unadjusted risk difference of 4.8 percentage points between the control group and the All Texts group translates to an odds ratio of 0.778,  $p=0.085$ . Amongst the subgroup of women who reported receiving program texts, we see a clearly stronger association, with an OR of 0.645 and a  $p$ -value of 0.0078. This association is statistically significant even with a Bonferroni-correction accounting for 3 group comparisons in both the full and subgroup data, for a total of 6 tests. Adding covariates to the model to account for potential bias and add precision strengthens these findings, though only slightly. Using all observations, assignment to All Texts is associated with an almost significant odds ratio of 0.74,  $p=.058$  of having a caesarean delivery compared to the control group. Within the subset that acknowledged receiving program texts, the association is an OR of 0.589,  $p=0.0035$ . This  $p$ -value remains statistically significant even with a

Bonferroni correction for multiple testing accounting for 12 tests; namely, the three group comparisons across 4 regression models.

The mechanism by which receipt of the full text message bank seems to have reduced demand for caesarean sections is not entirely clear. The potential causal routes are a) altering women's underlying preferences for mode of delivery, b) empowering women to decline doctor suggested caesareans by increasing their knowledge of delivery and labor self-efficacy, or c) reducing the number of legitimate indications for caesarean sections. There is weak evidence that the Care Seeking message bank alone had a larger odds reduction of caesareans than the Home Practices message bank alone, but each estimate is well within the confidence interval of the other. If the Care Seeking messages were truly the more effective, this could potentially indicate that messages about proper caesarean indications and cautions about the risks involved were more effective than messages about natural ways to reduce delivery pain. However, it could also indicate that other aspects of the Care-Seeking messages prevented legitimate caesarean indications by catching them sooner. The information available does not allow us to disentangle these pathways, nor are they mutually exclusive. Moreover, whether or not one group alone is more efficacious than the other, receipt of All Texts together showed the strongest reduction in caesareans, suggesting that the most efficacious strategy is to deliver them together.

Our study has several limitations. Perhaps most importantly, it is limited by the fact that women are trusted to self-report their delivery method to health workers. If women in intervention groups felt a pressure to report vaginal delivery even in the case of caesarean delivery due to the intervention causing them to believe vaginal delivery to be the more socially desirable answer,

then our results could be over-stated. If possible, confirming the self-reports by analysis of medical records could be a useful subsequent analysis. It is also limited by the study population being concentrated in one district of one province; it is unknown whether the results would remain the same in other districts and other provinces. Finally, very high loss to follow-up lowered the planned statistical power of our study. Loss to follow-up does not seem associated with treatment assignment, and baseline covariates are balanced within both the full sample and the subset that completed the study, which suggests loss to follow-up is hopefully not biasing our results. However, we cannot measure whether it is associated with outcomes, and in particular with mode of delivery, and as such we cannot confidently rule out the possibility that high loss to follow-up has altered our findings.

As a first of its kind, this intervention and evaluation breaks ground in the fields of SMS for maternal health in China and SMS for influencing mode of delivery. Though it is unknown how results would vary in national and international contexts, the effects measured herein indicate that similar intervention studies are warranted in other settings.

In 2015, China had 16.55 Million new births (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2016). With the recent relaxations in China's one child policy, this number could grow considerably in the next few years. If even the weakest estimate of the full text message bank ( $OR=0.778$ ) held in the general Chinese population, and assuming a national caesarean section rate of 46.2%, national distribution of the full text message bank would imply a national reduction of 6.1 percentage points in the proportion of women who deliver via caesarean section. If, as Liu et al. 2014 estimates, 15.5% of deliveries in China are caesarean delivery on maternal request, such a

reduction would be a sizeable improvement in CDMR rates; though one the left continued need for improvement. These are strong assumptions, but given the risks that unnecessary caesarean sections pose, the excessive amount that China currently has, as well as the fact that caesarean sections cost roughly double what vaginal deliveries cost in China's big cities (Mi and Liu, 2014), wider distribution the Newborn Health Project's messages on delivery mode seems a strategy worth trying.

## **Conclusion**

A quasi-randomized control trial distributing informational text messages to pregnant women in Gaoling, China found evidence that the full set of text messages may have reduced the number of caesarean deliveries in that group by 4.8 percentage points over the control group. Focusing on the set of women who reported actually receiving program texts and adjusting for baseline covariates greatly strengthened this measured relationship. Given numerous calls for strategies to reduce the rate of medically unnecessary caesarean sections in China and elsewhere, exploration of wider distribution of these text messages in China seems warranted.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- 50+ Amazing WeChat Statistics [WWW Document], 2014. . DMR. URL <http://expandedramblings.com/index.php/wechat-statistics/> (accessed 3.30.16).
- Betrán, A.P., Ye, J., Moller, A.-B., Zhang, J., Gülmezoglu, A.M., Torloni, M.R., 2016. The Increasing Trend in Caesarean Section Rates: Global, Regional and National Estimates: 1990-2014. *PloS One* 11, e0148343.
- Dong, H., 2003. Health Financing Policies: Patient Care-Seeking Behavior in Rural China. *Int. J. Technol. Assess. Health Care* 19, 526–32.
- Evans, W.D., Wallace, J.L., Snider, J., 2012. Pilot evaluation of the text4baby mobile health program. *BMC Public Health* 12, 1031. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-1031
- Feng, X.L., Wang, Y., An, L., Ronsmans, C., 2014. Cesarean section in the People's Republic of China: current perspectives. *Int J Womens Heal.* 6, 59–74.

- Gilliam, M., 2006. Cesarean delivery on request: reproductive consequences, in: *Seminars in Perinatology*. Elsevier, pp. 257–260.
- Huang, C.-M., Wu, H.-L., Huang, S.-H., Chien, L.-Y., Guo, J.-L., 2013. Transtheoretical model-based passive smoking prevention programme among pregnant women and mothers of young children. *Eur. J. Public Health*. doi:10.1093/eurpub/cks177
- Huang, K., Tao, F., Faragher, B., Raven, J., Tolhurst, R., Tang, S., Van Den Broek, N., 2013. A mixed-method study of factors associated with differences in caesarean section rates at community level: the case of rural China. *Midwifery* 29, 911–920.
- Jareethum, R., Titapant, V., Tienthai, C., Viboonchart, S., Chuenwattana, P., Chatchainoppakhun, J., 2008. Satisfaction of Healthy Pregnant Women Receiving Short Message Service via Mobile Phone for Prenatal Support: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Med Assoc Thai* 91, 458–63.
- Ji, H., Jiang, H., Yang, L., Qian, X., Tang, S., 2015. Factors contributing to the rapid rise of caesarean section: a prospective study of primiparous Chinese women in Shanghai. *BMJ Open* 5, e008994.
- Kainu, J.P., Sarvela, J., Tiippana, E., Halmesmäki, E., Korttila, K.T., 2010. Persistent pain after caesarean section and vaginal birth: a cohort study. *Int. J. Obstet. Anesth.* 19, 4–9.
- King, G., Honaker, J., Joseph, A., Scheve, K., 2001. Analyzing incomplete political science data: An alternative algorithm for multiple imputation, in: *American Political Science Association*. Cambridge Univ Press, pp. 49–69.
- Liu, X., Landon, M.B., Cheng, W., Chen, Y., 2015. Cesarean delivery on maternal request in China: what are the risks and benefits? *Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol.* 212, 817–e1.
- Liu, Y., Li, G., Chen, Y., Wang, X., Ruan, Y., Zou, L., Zhang, W., 2014. A descriptive analysis of the indications for caesarean section in mainland China. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 14.
- Lumbiganon, P., Laopaiboon, M., Gülmezoglu, A.M., Souza, J.P., Taneepanichskul, S., Ruyan, P., Attygalle, D.E., Shrestha, N., Mori, R., Hinh, N.D., others, 2010. Method of delivery and pregnancy outcomes in Asia: the WHO global survey on maternal and perinatal health 2007–08. *The Lancet* 375, 490–499.
- Lund, S., Hemed, M., Nielsen, B.B., Said, A., Said, K., Makungu, M.H., Rasch, V., 2012. Mobile phones as a health communication tool to improve skilled attendance at delivery in Zanzibar: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *BJOG Int. J. Obstet. Gynaecol.* 119, 1256–1264. doi:10.1111/j.1471-0528.2012.03413.x
- Mi, J., Liu, F., 2014. Rate of caesarean section is alarming in China. *Lancet* 383, 1463–4.
- National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2016. China's Economy Realized a Moderate but Stable and Sound Growth in 2015 [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.stats.gov.cn/english/PressRelease/201601/t20160119\\_1306072.html](http://www.stats.gov.cn/english/PressRelease/201601/t20160119_1306072.html) (accessed 3.7.16).
- Naughton, F., Jamison, J., Sutton, S., 2013. Attitudes towards SMS text message smoking cessation support: a qualitative study of pregnant smokers. *Health Educ. Res.* doi:10.1093/her/cyt057
- Noordam, A.C., Kuepper, B.M., Stekelenburg, J., Milen, A., 2011. Improvement of maternal health services through the use of mobile phones. *Trop. Med. Int. Heal. TM IH* 16, 622–626. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2011.02747.x
- Souza, J.P., Gülmezoglu, A.M., Lumbiganon, P., Laopaiboon, M., Carroli, G., Fawole, B., Ruyan, P., 2010. Caesarean section without medical indications is associated with an

- increased risk of adverse short-term maternal outcomes: the 2004-2008 WHO Global Survey on Maternal and Perinatal Health. *BMC Med.* 8, 10.1186/1741-7015-8-71.
- Tamrat, T., Kachnowski, S., 2012. Special delivery: an analysis of mHealth in maternal and newborn health programs and their outcomes around the world. *Matern. Child Health J.* 16, 1092–1101. doi:10.1007/s10995-011-0836-3
- Tang, S., Li, X., Wu, Z., 2006. Rising cesarean delivery rate in primiparous women in urban China: evidence from three nationwide household health surveys. *Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol.* 195, 1527–1532.
- Thompson, J.F., Roberts, C.L., Currie, M., Ellwood, D.A., 2002. Prevalence and persistence of health problems after childbirth: associations with parity and method of birth. *Birth* 29, 83–94.
- Villar, J., Carroli, G., Zavaleta, N., Donner, A., Wojdyla, D., Faundes, A., Velazco, A., Bataglia, V., Langer, A., Narváez, A., others, 2007. Maternal and neonatal individual risks and benefits associated with caesarean delivery: multicentre prospective study. *Bmj* 335, 1025–1029. doi:10.1136/bmj.39363.706956.55
- Visco, A.G., Viswanathan, M., Lohr, K.N., Wechter, M.E., Gartlehner, G., Wu, J.M., Palmieri, R., Funk, M.J., Lux, L., Swinson, T., others, 2006. Cesarean delivery on maternal request: maternal and neonatal outcomes. *Obstet. Gynecol.* 108, 1517–1529.
- Vogel, J.P., Betrán, A.P., Vindevoghel, N., Souza, J.P., Torloni, M.R., Zhang, J., Tunçalp, Ö., Mori, R., Morisaki, N., Ortiz-Panozo, E., others, 2015. Use of the Robson classification to assess caesarean section trends in 21 countries: a secondary analysis of two WHO multicountry surveys. *Lancet Glob. Heal.* 3, e260–e270.
- Wispelwey, B.P., Sheiner, E., 2013. Cesarean delivery in obese women: a comprehensive review. *J. Matern. Fetal Neonatal Med.* 26, 547–551.
- World Health Organization, 2015. WHO Statement on Caesarean Section Rates.
- Zhang, J., Liu, Y., Meikle, S., Zheng, J., Sun, W., Li, Z., 2008. Cesarean delivery on maternal request in southeast China. *Obstet. Gynecol.* 111, 1077–1082.

### APPENDIX 3.1. SMS Messages, by General Topic, Treatment Group, and Timing

Randomized Group	Message Categories	Message delivery time and total number of SMS messages				
		Sign-up day	First Trimester	Second Trimester	Third Trimester	Final day
<b>Basic Group (25)</b>	Fetal development (19)	2	6	6	3	2
	Reminders for prenatal visit and hospital delivery (6)		1	1	4	
<b>Care-seeking Group (82)</b>	Fetal development (19)	2	6	6	3	2
	Reminders for prenatal visit and hospital delivery (8)		2	2	4	
	Warnings & Recognition of danger signs (45)		5	23	17	
	Reminders for government-subsidized projects (10)		3	2	5	
<b>Good Household Prenatal Practice Group (91)</b>	Fetal development (19)	2	6	6	3	2
	Reminders for prenatal visit and hospital delivery (6)		1	1	4	
	Healthy lifestyle (Nutrition, physical activity, etc.) (37)		15	16	6	
	Mental health during pregnancy (8)		1	4	3	
	Pain management (9)			4	5	
	Labor (6)			3	3	
	Breastfeeding (6)				6	
<b>All Texts: Full SMS Bank (148)</b>	Full bank (148)	2	32	60	52	2

## **APPENDIX 3.2**

### **MESSAGES REGARDING DELIVERY ADVICE BY TREATMENT ARM**

#### **COMPARISON GROUP / BASIC**

None

#### **CARE SEEKING**

Day 158: Cord around the neck is a common, ultrasound, fetal movement monitoring can help diagnose it. If abnormal, please seek immediate medical attention, and choose the appropriate delivery method with the guidance of the doctor.

Day 205: Vaginal delivery is the most reliable delivery method unless doctor suggests you to use c-section. Although anesthesia in C-section would cause no pain during your delivery, you will still be painful during recovery. Usually, C-section takes more time to recovery. If you feel much pain after delivery, you could take painkilling medicines according to the doctor's prescription.

Day 207: Vaginal bleeding in the third trimester may indicate placenta previa, if diagnosed by ultrasound, you should take more rest, avoid fatigue and vaginal stimulation. If necessary, you may need caesarean section.

Day 209: Don't panic about baby malposition. Sometimes malposition can be self-corrected. As long as you go to regular prenatal care, and choose the right delivery approach according to your doctor, you can deliver safely.



Day 223: The use of anesthesia for "painless childbirth" can reduce pain, but it can also bring risks. Experts suggest less intervention and a more natural way of labor. Avoid using medicine or surgical operations unless there are medical reasons for doing so.

Day 263: Doctors will decide whether you should have early admission, fetal monitoring and your delivery approach by measuring the inside and outside of the pelvis and ultrasonography. If doctors suggest you to have vaginal delivery, please don't say no just because of fear of pain.

Day 268: If you have passed the expected due date, please do not worry. Only 5% of babies are born within the due date. The doctor will use ultrasound and fetal heart rate monitor to check the safety of pregnancy.

## **HOME PRACTICES**

Day 104: Breathing training can help you stay relaxed and calm during childbirth. Rama breathing exercise is the most commonly used, and it can help reduce the pain during labor. Key message: Take a deep nasal breath with your nose, and then exhale slowly through your mouth. Please consult the Maternal and Infant Healthcare Center for details.

Day 121: Prenatal classes on delivery are also a good way to help you understand the labor process. To be more prepared, you can take a prenatal class in addition to our 'Baby Letter'.

Day 140: Good control of hormone levels will help reduce the pain. During labor, please keep calm and confident, which could help regulate the secretion of hormones, thereby reducing pain.

Day 163: There are three main ways to delivery a baby: natural childbirth (without anesthesia); painless childbirth (using local anesthetic); caesarean section. If no high risk factors, it is better to choose natural childbirth. If you want to use natural birth but are very afraid of the pain, you can learn more about how to reduce pain during childbirth.

Day 172: For most normal pregnancy, vaginal delivery is the most reliable method, and is more beneficial for the mother's recovery compared to C-section, it also increases the success of breastfeeding.

Day 177: Pelvic exercises will make your childbirth easier and help prevent complications such as perineal tear. Pelvic exercises have the following steps: contraction of the anus and vagina, then relax. You can practice it whenever you have time.

Day 200: Vaginal delivery is the most reliable delivery method. For most of the normal pregnancy, natural childbirth is better for recovery, more beneficial for baby and has a higher rate of successful breastfeeding compared to caesarean section.

Day 202: Still remember Lamaze breathing exercises? Do not forget to keep training your breathing? Key points are to take a deep breath through nasal, then exhale through your mouth

slowly. This can help stay relaxed and calm during childbirth, can reduce the pain from production.

Day 210: Do you have confidence in the delivery? Do you feel a little worried or panic? Tell your concerns to your doctor, and learn some information about labor and delivery in advance. You will feel more comfortable with someone familiar around you.

Day 224: When delivering a baby, in addition to using local anesthetic, there are many other ways to relieve pain, such as deep breathing, massage, and try different production poses.

Day 237: During labor, lower back massage can reduce pain. But also can massage the head and face, to relax and unwind.

Day 247: You don't have to lie on the bed before labor. You can walk, stood, swaying body in the delivery room, leaning against the wall leaning, kneeling, or lying on the bed in her husband's body. As a mother, you have the intuition to judge what kind of position most comfortable.

Day 259: Contractions may sometimes cause pain that even affect normal language dialogue, how to cope with contractions? Please take a deep breath. When you take a deep breath, there is more oxygen to be delivered to your uterus and the fetus, and lead to mild pain relief.

Day 266: Labor pain is not persistent pain, but a wave of pain. After each contraction, please relax to better cope with the next contraction.

Day 270: Moderate exercise can help start the delivery. Walking, climbing stairs and pre-gymnastics recommended sports. But you should have company during exercise.

### **ALL TEXTS GROUP**

Includes all messages listed above from all groups. Messages sent to this group were sent on the same days as in the other groups.

## CHAPTER IV

### The Association of Familial Support with Birth Weight and Prenatal Behaviors In A Cohort from Xi'an China

#### ABSTRACT

**Objective:** Studies of social support in numerous contexts have indicated that it is often positively associated with better health in numerous contexts, but this pattern is not consistent across all contexts, nor is the mechanism of association fully understood. Whether there is an association of family social support during pregnancy and birth outcomes in China has not been evaluated. This paper aims to measure the association of family support and odds of small for gestational age amongst newborns, as well as explore a range of pregnancy health behaviors as potential mediators of an association.

**Design:** An observational study was conducted in Xi'an China with 1,952 expecting mothers. Surveys were used to measure the association of levels of self-reported family support with occurrence of small for gestational age (SGA) and 5 different health behaviors during pregnancy: timing of initiation of antenatal care, seeking medical attention during illness, supplementing nutrients, frequency of moderate exercise, and smoking during pregnancy. Logistic regression was run of SGA on self-reported family support, both with and without an array of control variables.

**Main Outcomes Measure:** The proportion of newborns born small for gestational age women with high and low levels of family support.

**Results:** Unadjusted logistic regression indicated that high levels of family support for a mother was associated with reduced odds of delivering a child who was small for their gestational age; odds ratio (OR) =.726,  $p=.030$ . Adjusted logistic regression incorporating an array of covariates found that high levels of family support for a mother was associated with even lower odds of delivering a child who was small for their gestational age; OR =.681,  $p=.013$ . Using Baron and Kenny's (1986) criterion for mediation analysis, evidence suggested that the association of family support and reduced odds of small for gestational age was at least partially mediated by better nutrition supplementation and more moderate exercise amongst women with high levels of family support.

## INTRODUCTION

The literature across many health disciplines has convincingly demonstrated that supportive relationships have protective effects on a variety of physical and mental health outcomes (Gallant, 2003). With regards to pregnancy specifically, a substantial number of studies report that social support exerts a positive impact on a pregnant woman's psychological well-being, as well as on the health of her newborn (Fernández and Newby, 2010). The greatest amount of evidence is on the positive link between social support and birth weight (Dunkel Schetter, 2011; Feldman et al., 2000; Orr, 2004). Exactly why this association may exist, however, is not fully clear. Though social support's effect on health is primarily hypothesized to be via neuroendocrine response, inflammatory/immune response, and behavioral, there is very limited evidence for the full pathway between social support and adverse birth outcomes (Dunkel Schetter, 2011).

Moreover, there is an open question as to whether a linkage between social support and newborn health holds at all outside of the West. Whilst a large literature from Western countries has established a connection between the quality of marital relationships and health, except for work on domestic violence, the connection between maternal health and family relationship quality has largely been neglected in non-Western contexts, and has not been accompanied by a complementary focus on the positive dimensions of family relationships (Allendorf, 2010). Researchers have called for a focus on the cross-cultural contexts in which social support provision and receipt can occur (Nurullah, 2012), and regarding pregnancy, as stated by Kratz

and colleagues: “research should examine how social support may affect health beliefs among women who hold non-Western beliefs regarding pregnancy practices (Kratz et al., 2013).”

This paper will contribute to the literature by investigating whether an association between familial support during pregnancy and newborn health, as proxied by the metric “small for gestational age” exists in the non-Western context of rural China, using a sample drawn from Xi’an. If an association is found, this paper will further contribute to the literature by investigating possible behavioral mediation pathways by which a connection family support and newborn size for gestational age might be linked. Specifically, self reported measures of nutritional supplementation, exercise frequency, timing of antenatal care initiation, care-seeking during illness, and smoking during pregnancy will be available for mediation analysis.

In 2015, China had 16.55 Million new births (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2016). With the very recent relaxations in China’s one child policy, this number could grow considerably in the next few years. Understanding the current influences of newborn health in China, particularly as influenced by modifiable health behaviors, could potentially benefit millions of new parents and health practitioners during years that could see a baby boom within the country.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Social Support & Health**

Though not yet documented in the literature, there is yet good reason to hypothesize and investigate whether a connection between social support and newborn health might exist outside



of Western countries. Reason to expect an association can be drawn from similar findings in other health domains. For example, it has been found that social support is an important factor in immune, endocrine, and cardiovascular functioning; recovery from illness and injury; and health maintenance (DiMatteo, 2004). There has been strong evidence from systematic reviews that poor social relations are a risk factor for developing cardiovascular disease as well as poorer prognosis upon diagnosis (Tay et al., 2013). Amongst the most important reasons to study social support and health is that the evidence is clear that better social support is associated with lowered mortality. A 2013 meta-analysis and meta-regression of self-reported social support and all-cause mortality that included 178 estimates from 50 publications in their analysis found that mortality among those with low levels of perceived support had an adjusted hazard ratio for all-cause mortality of 1.11 (95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.05, 1.17) (Shor et al., 2013). Most relevant to China, a 2015 study from China found that increases in social support increased the odds of taking medication and measuring blood pressure regularly amongst hypertension patients (Hu et al., 2015).

### **The Pathway Between Social Support And Health**

There are two main hypotheses on how social support can influence health. The first, known as the “stress-buffering” hypothesis, posits that social support mitigates the impact of stressful events by reducing stress and facilitating coping, thereby reducing detrimental psychological and physiological stress responses (Aaronson, 1989; Harley and Eskenazi, 2006; Kratz et al., 2013; Orr, 2004). A related but distinct strain of this hypothesis posits a “direct” positive effect on psychology and physiology that can exist without highly stressful events to buffer (Harley and Eskenazi, 2006; Orr, 2004). The second main hypothesis is that social support affects health by

enabling or enhancing adherence to health behaviors that are beneficial to health (Aaronson, 1989; Cannella, 2006; Fernández and Newby, 2010; Harley and Eskenazi, 2006; Kratz et al., 2013). Review of the literature suggests evidence for all of these mechanisms (Kratz et al., 2013; Orr, 2004), and they are not mutually exclusive.

### **Social Support And Health Behavior**

Evidence for the link between social support and health behaviors is myriad. In the realm of medication adherence, meta-analyses establish significant average *r*-effect sizes between adherence and various measures of social support, including practical, emotional, and unidimensional (DiMatteo, 2004). A 2003 systematic review of social support and chronic illness self-management found that the studies included provided evidence for a modest positive relationship between social support and chronic illness self-management, especially for diabetes (Gallant, 2003). Specifically, of the 13 methodologically sound 13 quantitative articles, six found significant positive relationships between social support and self-management behaviors, and an additional six studies found at least partial support for a positive association. Further, the seven qualitative studies included also provided strong evidence that social support can provide instrumental and emotional support that is recipients perceive to positively influence self-management (Gallant, 2003). A study of university students across 16 European countries found low levels of social support were related to poor health behaviors, such as irregular sleep, lack of exercise, and not wearing seatbelts (Allgöwer et al., 2001). There is a proliferation of evidence for social relations specific to physical activity (Tay et al., 2013), including a meta-analysis of 87 studies showing that social influence is associated with exercise adherence and exercise behaviors (Carron et al., 2010).

However, more social support does not always mean better health behaviors, as studies on tobacco and alcohol use make clear. A review and meta-analysis of alcoholism treatment programs found that social support had a positive associations, but they were inconsistent and weak (Beattie, 2001). Despite evidence of an association between social support and limiting smoking and alcohol consumption among pregnant women (Cannella, 2006), there has been little evidence in intervention studies that social support interventions are effective in improving abstinence (Tay et al., 2013). One's social network can set bad examples as well as good (Aaronson, 1989), and particularly susceptible are diet (de Jersey, 2013; Gallant, 2003; Tay et al., 2013) and substance abuse (Kimbrow, 2008; Kratz et al., 2013; Tay et al., 2013). "Nagging" can be unsuccessful and even stress inducing, potentially even causing patients to be less confident in caring for their own disease (Kimbrow, 2008; Kratz et al., 2013; Rosland and Piette, 2010). Interactions may also be complex and inconsistent. For example, while support specific to pregnancy matters has been found negatively associated with drinking during pregnancy, general support appears to predict high levels of drinking prior to becoming pregnant (Stephens, 1985). With these complexities in mind, it has been postulated that social relations may have more positive associations with health behaviors that are less frequently shared between the focal individual and their social network (Tay et al., 2013).

### **Social Support & Behavior During Pregnancy In Other Contexts**

A number of studies, predominantly investigated in western cultures, have already shown an association between social support and pregnancy health behaviors. Perceived and/or received support, as well as simply being married, have been repeatedly shown to be predictors of reduced

consumption of alcohol and drug use (Aaronson, 1989; Fernández and Newby, 2010; Harley and Eskenazi, 2006; Kimbro, 2008; Martin et al., 2007; Yargawa and Leonardi-Bee, 2015). Regarding delivery, several studies have shown that male partner attendance at a woman's antenatal care (ANC) checkups is positively associated with the presence of a skilled health worker being present during delivery (Aguilar and Jennings, 2015), and one study from India has shown that women in better marital relationships are more likely than others to deliver in a health-care facility (Allendorf, 2010). A small amount of evidence, all from the United States or Canada, has shown that in those contexts, women with more family support engaged in healthier eating and had increased usage of prenatal vitamins (Fernández and Newby, 2010; Fowles and Fowles, 2008; Harley and Eskenazi, 2006; Nash et al., 2013). Some women first seek antenatal care at family member's suggestion (Fernández and Newby, 2010), and at least one study shows that women with more involved partners initiate earlier prenatal care (Martin et al., 2007), though this does not always seem to be the case (Harley and Eskenazi, 2006). Multiple studies show that women with more familial and other social support get more prenatal care (Allendorf, 2010; Fernández and Newby, 2010; Kimbro, 2008; Leal et al., 2011), although this can vary with familial living arrangements (Allendorf, 2010). Moreover, at least two investigations that have used composite measures of health promotion during pregnancy found positive relations between social support and positive health practices (Cannella, 2006; Chen et al., 2007).

Though the majority of evidence point towards positive effects of social support on pregnancy behaviors, not all studies have found consistently positive findings. A 2007 study from Nepal found no significant differences in skilled birth attendance by women randomized to receive ANC education with their husbands vs. those randomized to receive it alone (Mullany et al.,

2007). Further, male antenatal accompaniment at ANC does not always predict subsequent utilization (Aguilar and Jennings, 2015).

### **Current Research Frontiers**

Despite this growing body of research on social support, health behaviors, and birth outcomes, numerous questions remain unanswered. As mentioned, one is whether this linkage holds outside of the West. Asia is a particularly important location to investigate in this regard. Taylor et al. found that though “Social support is believed to be a universally valuable resource for combating stress, yet Asians and Asian Americans report that social support is not helpful to them, resist seeking it, and are underrepresented among recipients of supportive services (Taylor et al., 2007).” Distinguishing between explicit and implicit social support, the authors further found that “Asians and Asian Americans are psychologically and biologically benefited more by implicit social support than by explicit social support, [but] the reverse is true for European Americans (Taylor et al., 2007).” This differential reaction to social support may change or eliminate the physiological or behavioral connections between social support and birth outcomes in Asian contexts.

Considering that health behaviors have been hypothesized to mediate connections between social support and health, it is worth noting that that “different sets of predictors, in different constellations, may determine changes in different health behaviors,” and that “Only a few studies have examined changes in multiple health behaviors (Park and Gaffey, 2007).” Some relationships between social support and pregnancy behaviors, such as abstinence from smoking and drinking, have been well studied. Others, such as diet and exercise, have been less

represented, or have conflicting evidence, as is the case with the adequacy of ANC utilization. Discovering a connection between social support and health immediately poses the non-trivial question of what mediating factors are connecting the two.

Finally, there has also been a disconnect between observational findings regarding social support and health outcomes and intervention findings regarding the same. Orr et al.'s 2004 review of social support and pregnancy outcomes found that the overall evidence from observational studies showed that social support to be associated with improved outcomes, particularly in the area of birth weight. However, they also found that interventions to increase social support during pregnancy often produced “disappointing” results. This casts lingering potential doubt on a causal relationship between social support and outcomes.

### **Intended Contribution of the Current Study**

Despite a large body of literature on social support and health, whether social support is associated with better birth outcomes in the People's Republic of China specifically seems to have no specific published evidence to support or contradict a connection. A single study from Taiwan (Lin et al., 2009) was the most relevant citation found, and though promising, that study substituted perceived social norms as a proxy for social support, and moreover may not represent social influences from within the PRC.

With this literature gap in mind, this paper will investigate whether family support is associated with better birth outcomes amongst women in the Xi'an area of China's Shaanxi province. Given that social support and birth weight have the most supportive literature in other contexts so far,

“small for gestational age” (SGA) was chosen as the fundamental metric for neonatal health at birth. SGA is defined by the WHO as infants below the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile of birth weight for their gestational age (Lee et al., 2013).

Our methodology is intended to add to and improve upon previous research in several ways. First, SGA is generally considered a more relevant health marker than raw birth weight continuously measured, as has been more often studied. A recent meta-analysis pooling 20 cohorts from low and middle-income countries found that SGA was associated with a relative risk of neonatal mortality of 1.83 (95% CI: 1.34-2.50) and 1.90 (1.32-2.73) for post neonatal mortality (Katz et al., 2013). It is also a more specific metric than the commonly used “Low birth weight.” Low birth weight can be caused by either of two different factors with different underlying causes and different risks, namely pre-term birth and intrauterine growth restriction. By accounting for gestational age, SGA is a commonly accepted proxy for intrauterine growth restriction specifically, though it does not differentiate causes of that restriction, which can include chronic undernutrition, placental insufficiency, infections, or other factors (Lee et al., 2013). It can be useful to differentiate between pre-term birth, SGA and their co-occurrence, as their associated relative risks of neonatal death are different, and their co-occurrence has a higher relative risk of neonatal death than either alone (Katz et al., 2013).

Second, as Orr pointed out in their review of social support and pregnancy, many studies reported correlation coefficients and mean differences, but did not provide data for crude or adjusted odds ratios, and stated that “Clearly, additional research is needed in this area (Orr, 2004).” This paper will provide both unadjusted and covariate adjusted odds ratios derived from

logistic regression, with the aim of accounting for the most likely confounding covariates. Third, our sample (N=1,952) is larger than any of the four studies of social support and birth weight discussed in Orr's review, the largest of which had 247 participants, and in fact has a sample size larger than all four combined (Orr, 2004). This gives us much greater power to accurately estimate the association of social support and birth size in our study population than has been the case in study populations so far. Fourth, our focus on family support specifically may target the most important source of social support. In their meta-analysis of social support and mortality, Shor et al. noted that the protective effect of support from family was stronger than that of support from friends  $p=.002$  (Shor et al., 2013). It may be that different sources of social support ought to be analyzed separately, though this has not always been done in previous studies.

A final potential contribution of this investigation is that engagement measures for a number of pregnancy health behaviors potentially relevant to SGA are also collected. Thus, any evidence of a link between family support and SGA, if found, can be further investigated via a mediation analysis to discover what, if any, pregnancy behaviors reported may explain the linkage. The relevant behaviors surveyed are nutrition supplementation, smoking during pregnancy, care-seeking during illness, timing of antenatal care initiation, and moderate exercise frequency. The exact metrics used for these behaviors and their potential relations to SGA will be discussed in subsequent sections.

## **DATA AND METHODS**

### **Study Population and Data Collection**



The data for this study comes from Evaluation for mHealth Intervention's (EMI) Newborn Health project, which is investigating the effect of a short message service (SMS) intervention on maternal and newborn health and health behaviors in a cohort of women in Xi'an China. The Newborn Health project offers expectant mothers in rural China a package of free short messages via cell phone regarding pregnancy and childbirth. These messages are tailored to each mother's gestational week, and it is hypothesized that delivering these short advice messages to pregnant women can improve maternal and newborn health. EMI's Newborn Health Project utilizes a quasi-randomized factorial assignment that places each participant into one of four possible message package arms based on the expecting mother's birthday. This paper does not investigate the effect of these different message treatments on pregnancy health behaviors or pregnancy outcomes; rather it uses the data generated from the project to investigate whether family support is connected to SGA, and if so, if the linkage is mediated by pregnancy health behaviors. However, in most regression specifications, treatment arm is included as a control variable as treatment arms were designed to be influential on both pregnancy behaviors and outcomes.

Prior to randomization, a baseline survey was conducted with each enrollee. This survey collected demographic data, self-reported health data, as well as data relating to each enrollees' thoughts and perceptions regarding health during pregnancy and childbirth.

A week after each delivery, a follow-up survey was conducted by a health worker at the mother's home. This survey collected several birth outcomes, including mode of delivery, birth weight, and gestational week. It also measured retrospective categorizations of pregnancy health behaviors, as well as other pregnancy related questions, including the self reported amount of

how much family support the woman received during pregnancy. The three possible responses for the amount of social support were “None,” “Some,” and “A lot.”

Four of the pregnancy health behaviors measured in the follow up survey and one measured at baseline were considered potentially relevant to SGA, and had the potential to mediate any significant connection of family support to SGA. They were:

1) *Supplementing Any Nutrients*: Women were queried during follow up on their supplementation of calcium, iron, folic acid, and protein powder during pregnancy. Because it was anticipated that supplementation of each was likely to be correlated with the others, a composite behavioral measure was created to indicate whether women supplemented at least one of *any* of the nutrients calcium, iron, or protein powder. Folic acid supplementation was omitted from this indicator because 90.7% of respondents reported supplementing folic acid, and if included the proportion supplementing any nutrient was 95.9%, which was anticipated to leave too little variation from which to make meaningful inferences. It is beyond the scope of this investigation to detail the literature surrounding maternal nutrition and birth weight, but we proceeded with the very strong expectation that nutrition supplementation would be associated with a reduced rates of SGA.

2) *Seeking Care During Illness*: Women were then asked during follow up whether they had had experienced certain symptoms during pregnancy, and conditional upon answering yes, whether they had sought care for those specific symptoms. Those twelve symptoms were i) Vaginal bleeding (except during labor), ii) Sudden vision change, iii) Vomiting (except routine morning

sickness), iv) Moderate to severe dizziness, v) Mild fever, vi) Moderate to high fever, vii) Mild abdominal pain, viii) Moderate to severe abdominal pain, ix) Abnormal discharge, x) Mild swelling/edema, xi) Moderate to severe swelling/edema, and xii) Other serious pain. Women were coded as “Ill” if they reported experiencing at least one of these symptoms. Women were further coded as “Sought Care” if were coded as “Ill” *and* reported seeking medical attention for at least one of their symptoms. They were coded as “Did Not Seek Care” if either they experienced symptoms but reported no extra care or if they simply experienced no queried symptoms. Seeking care during illness is expected have a protective association with SGA, as conditions potentially causing SGA would potentially be noticed and corrected more quickly.

3) *Moderate Exercise Frequency During Pregnancy*: Women were asked during follow up how often they had engaged in “moderate exercise” during pregnancy. The five possible responses were “Never”, “Less than once a month”, “Once to three times per month”, “One to four times per week”, and “Four times per week or more.” This variable was coded as a 5-level, ordinal variable. The relationship between moderate exercise and low birth weight / SGA is an active area of research. Moderate exercise has generally been viewed as an avenue to potentially preclude the opposite problem of Large for Gestational Age as well as to guard against gestational diabetes. Potential concern has been raised as to whether moderate exercise actually may contribute to SGA for pregnancies at-risk for the condition. However, both a 2011 review of the literature and a 2015 meta-analysis on the topic conclude that prenatal exercise seems to protect against “Large at birth,” defined as either LGA or having macrosomia) without any increase in the odds of “small-at-birth,” defined as either SGA or low birth weight (Hopkins and Cutfield, 2011; Wiebe et al., 2015). There is also a recent trend in findings suggesting that

regular low to moderate exercise reduces the risk of being born at either extreme of the birth weight range (Siebel et al., 2012), though this potential benefit was not detected in Wiebe et al.'s 2015 meta-analysis. It is worth noting, however, that our original, unimputed sample size available for analysis of SGA is 1,930, which of itself nearly rivals the 2,183 subjects in the twelve analyses combined in Wiebe et al.'s 2015 meta-analysis of "small at birth." It is therefore felt that a test for a potential exercise - SGA association in our analysis can make a solid contribution to the same topic.

4) *Timing of First Antenatal Care (ANC) Checkup:* Women were enrolled in EMI's Newborn Health Project at their first ANC checkup, and their gestational week at the time of enrollment was recorded as an integer between 1 and 42. Timing of ANC initiation is a useful proxy for adequacy of ANC care. The most popular indices measuring the adequacy of prenatal care such as the Kessner Index, the GINDEX, and the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization (APNCU) all incorporate the timing of initiation of prenatal care amongst their key factors (VanderWeele et al., 2009). Studies have suggested that inadequate prenatal care as judged by different indices has been associated with adverse birth outcomes, though findings have been inconsistent and can vary by index (CHEN et al., 2007).

5) *Smoking During Pregnancy:* Smoking during pregnancy is a well acknowledged risk factor for adverse pregnancy outcomes, including multiple studies showing significant associations between smoking and the outcomes of SGA, low birth weight, and fetal growth restriction (Vardavas et al., 2010). Self-reported during follow up, smoking during pregnancy was

dichotomously indicated as being a smoker during pregnancy or not; no measures of frequency or intensity of smoking were recorded.

To categorize infants as SGA, it is necessary to compare each newborn's weight at birth to some reference standard for weight distribution at the newborn's gestational age. Defining the most appropriate standard for various populations worldwide has often been challenging and debatable (Mikolajczyk et al., 2011). Recently, Mikolajczyk et al. combined the fetal-weight reference developed by Hadlock and colleagues and the notion of proportionality proposed by Gardosi and colleagues to make a formula for a global reference standard adjustable to any local population. The authors validated their standard using the data from the 24 countries in the WHO Global Survey on Maternal and Perinatal Health, and found it to be a better predictor of adverse outcomes for neonates than non-customized standards (Mikolajczyk et al., 2011). This analysis uses Mikolajczyk et al.'s formula adjusted to the mean and variance of birth weight within China for births at 40 weeks, which was also gathered from Mikolajczyk et al., 2011. We defined SGA as birthweight below that predicted for the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile for gestational week as predicted by this formula, in accordance with the WHO's standard definition of SGA (Lee et al., 2013). Technical details of the operationalization of Mikolajczyk et al.'s formula for this study can be found in Appendix 4.1.

### **Statistical Analysis**

Before performing any hypothesis testing, relevant missingness in the dataset was addressed using multiple imputation. By far the most common strategy to handle missing data in analysis is to use "listwise deletion," which means to drop any observation from the analysis that does not

have an observed value for every variable in the analysis. However listwise deletion, under very weak assumptions, causes estimation errors of the same magnitude as the omitted variable bias that including (incompletely) observed variables is meant to correct (King et al., 2001). It's been shown that a process called "multiple imputation" using expectation maximization is one that will generally outperform listwise deletion or the other most common general techniques of handling missing data (King et al., 2001). A full description of the technique and proof of its superiority to other methods of dealing with missing data is beyond the scope of this paper. However, it will likely interest readers to know that to create usable data for subsequent analysis, multiple imputation must be performed simultaneously on *at least* every variable planned for analysis, with the dependent outcome of interest being no exception. Multiple imputation was performed in R using the Amelia package. This process created 16 imputed datasets that had "complete" data on all variables of interest. The pre-imputation number of complete observations (out of 1,952) of all variables and their range is reported in Appendix 4.2. All regression analyses were run once on each of the 16 imputed datasets, and the results combined using Rubin's technique for combining quantities of interest (King et al., 2001).

Once newborns were categorized as SGA, logistic regressions were run using the 16 imputed datasets to investigate whether high family support was associated with lowered odds of SGA. This unadjusted regression was then supplemented with a logistic regression which accounted for a wide array potentially confounding variables, all of which were collected in the baseline survey, with the single exception of the variable 'Ill,' which was measured retrospectively at follow-up. These variables fell into six categories, as follows:

**General Demographic Information:** These variables were age, education, husband's education, income, residency, and insurance coverage. Age and socioeconomic status have been found to be predictors of general pregnancy health behavior by Lin et al., 2009, and age and education were found to be a predictor of family support during pregnancy by Abdollahpour et al. 2015, though age was not found to be predictive of social support by Harley and Eskenazi, 2006. Income has been found to be a predictor of ANC uptake by Hohmann-Marriott, 2009 and better eating by Fowles and Fowles 2008, as well as lower levels of social support by Harley and Eskenazi, 2006. Medical insurance coverage was hypothesized to impact the number of ANC visits and care-seeking during illness, and could potentially alter the overall need for family support. Residency (Village, Township, County, City/Province) was postulated to potentially alter social norms around both health

**Pregnancy Medical History:** These variables were previous live birth, previous miscarriage, whether pregnancy was planned, and weight at start of pregnancy. Higher parity has been shown to be a predictor of lower social support by Abdollahpour et al. 2015 and Harley and Eskenazi 2006, though differential behavioral effects of previous live births and previous miscarriages has not, to our knowledge, been investigated. Fernández and Newby 2010 found that previous pregnancies played a hugely important role in informing women's behaviors during pregnancy. A large body of evidence shows that unplanned / unwanted pregnancies are associated with both lower levels of social support and worse pregnancy behaviors (Abdollahpour et al., 2015; Fernández and Newby, 2010; Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Martin et al., 2007; Onat and Aba, 2014). BMI has well studied associations with exercise and nutrition, though to our knowledge has not been linked in the literature to levels of social support.

***Household Substance Use:*** These baseline variables were whether the woman was a current drinker at baseline and whether the husband was a current smoker, former smoker, or non-smoker at baseline. Smoking and drinking more than minor amounts of alcohol during pregnancy are well known risk factors for SGA (Patra et al., 2011; Vardavas et al., 2010). Further, as discussed above, drinking and smoking can have complex relationships with social support. It was unknown whether they would be associated with family support in this population, or whether they would be markers for a propensity towards worse health behaviors. Whether the woman was a smoker at baseline was measured but not included in regressions as a control because it was predicted to be too highly collinear with whether she smoked during pregnancy, which was a factor reserved to be used in potential subsequent mediation analysis.

***Self-Assessed Health:*** Two incorporated baseline variables were a five level self-assessment of health ranging from very good to very poor, and self-assessed health compared to before pregnancy, rated as “Better,” “The Same,” “Worse,” and “Don’t know”. From follow-up, a woman was recorded as “Ill” if she reported one or more of the 12 symptoms queried by the follow-up survey. Many studies have found that perceived health status is an important predictor of health promoting lifestyles (Lin et al., 2009), and Tay et al. 2013 postulated that severely poor health may elicit more social support. Poor health in the mother can also directly impact the health of her unborn child.



***Treatment group assignment within the Newborn Health Project:*** The four different treatment groups received information and nudges on different health behaviors, and was potentially expected to be associated with several behaviors as well as health outcomes. Treatment assignment's possible relation to social support was not known a priori.

***Baseline measures of health psychology & perceptions:*** These nine variables, pulled from health behavior literature, were: Health Attitudes, Health Expectations, Health Self-Efficacy, Health Personal Pressure, Health Intentions, Health Plans, Perceived Health Social Norms, Perceived Susceptibility to Poor Health, and Perceived Severity of Potential Poor Health. All were measured by single question, 5-point Likert scales. It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a thorough review of relevant health behavior theory. However, the analysis did attempt to account for the major constructs of the most widely cited theories of health behavior, namely the Health Belief Model, Social Cognitive Theory, the Theory of Planned Behavior, The Theory of Reasoned Action, and the Transtheoretical Model. For more in-depth discussion, see (de Jersey, 2013; Lippke and Ziegelmann, 2008; Noar and Zimmerman, 2005).

If family support was found to be associated with SGA, a mediation analysis via health behavior was also planned. Details of the mediation analysis plan are described in subsequent sections.

## **RESULTS**

Descriptive statistics for all baseline characteristics of women in the dataset are reported in the previous chapter of this thesis as Table 3.1 of that chapter. Tables 4.1A and 4.1B below display

the pre-imputation descriptive statistics for both the independent variable (Family Support), the dependent variable (SGA), as well as the four pregnancy behavioral variables described in the methods section as potential behavioral predictors of SGA. Note that though originally measured in three categories, (A lot, Some, & None), family support has was dichotomized into High and Low. This was because only approximately 1% of study participants responded “None,” so the “None” category was merged with the “Some” category to create the “Low” category. Respondents answering “A lot” were coded as “High” family support.

**TABLE 4.1A: Selected Dichotomous Follow-Up Variables, Pre-Imputation**

<b>VARIABLE</b>	<b>YES (%)</b>	<b>NO (%)</b>	<b>TOTAL N</b>
Family Support = High	1221 - 63.7%	695 - 36.3%	1916
SGA	220 - 11.4%	1710 - 88.6%	1930
Supplements Any <sup>a</sup>	1350 - 69.7%	588 - 30.3%	1938
Seeks Care (Given Symptoms)	166 - 36.0%	295 - 64.0%	461
Smoked While Pregnant	32 - 1.7%	1895 - 98.3%	1927

a: Self reports supplementing any of calcium, iron, or protein powder during pregnancy

**TABLE 4.1B: Exercise Frequency At Follow-Up, Pre-Imputation**

<b>Exercise Frequency</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Never	226	14.4
<1x / month	189	9.8
1-3x / month	277	14.4
1-4x / week	374	19.5
>=4x / week	804	41.9
TOTAL	1920	100

The other behavioral variable of interest, week of ANC initiation, was measured at baseline, as presented in the last chapter. The average week of ANC initiation was 14.6, with a standard deviation of 7.0 weeks.

Results for the unadjusted model of SGA on high family support and the model adjusted for the full set of potentially confounding covariates are shown in Table 4.2 below. The full set of exponentiated regression coefficients for the adjusted regression presented in Table 3.

**TABLE 4.2: Adjusted and Unadjusted Odds Ratios of SGA with High Family Support**

	Odds Ratio	P-Value	
Unadjusted	0.726 (95% CI 0.544 - 0.969)	0.030	**
Adjusted	0.681 (95% CI 0.503 - 0.922)	0.013	**

\*  $p < .10$

\*\*  $p < .05$

These results show that with or without adjustment for covariates, high family support is associated reduced odds of SGA. The unadjusted association is an odds ratio (OR) of 0.726 ( $p=.030$ ), and the adjusted estimate is even stronger,  $OR=0.681$ , ( $p=.013$ ).

These findings raise the question of how family support and SGA might be related. A “buffering” effect or “direct” effect through physiological response to support may be occurring, or altered behavior may be mediating the connection, or both. A test of five possible behavioral mediators of this connection is presented below.

According to Baron and Kenny 1986, four conditions must be met using three regressions to establish mediation. First, the independent variable must affect the proposed mediator in the expected direction in regression analysis. Second, the independent variable must be shown to affect the dependent variable in the expected direction in regression analysis. Then, simultaneous regression of the dependent variable both the independent variable and the proposed mediator should show that third: the mediator affects the dependent variable in the expected direction while controlling for the independent variable, and fourth: that the independent variable’s

measured effect on the dependent variable while controlling for the mediator is less than when not controlling for the mediator in the second regression. Perfect mediation holds if the independent variable has no measured effect when controlling for the proposed mediator (Baron and Kenny, 1986).

The regression of SGA on family support laid out above is the one Baron and Kenny describe as testing and confirming the “second” criterion; that the independent variable (family support) is affecting the dependent one (odds of SGA). With this confirmed, mediation analysis can then be completed in two steps. The first step is to include these behaviors in the multivariable regression of SGA on Family support, and determine if their inclusion attenuates the measured association between family support and SGA. Table 4.3 below shows the results of this test, and presents the exponentiated coefficients of the full model with and without the five behaviors side by side for comparison.

**TABLE 4.3: Full Model Results of Logistic Regression of SGA on High Family Support**

	Small for Gestational Age No Behaviors					Small for Gestational Age With Behaviors				
	Odds Ratio	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	P Value		Odds Ratio	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	P Value	
Family Support Illness	0.681	0.503	0.922	0.013	**	0.772	0.556	1.072	0.122	
	1.247	0.907	1.714	0.174		1.457	1.010	2.103	0.044	**
Sought Care Pregnancy Smoking						0.786	0.431	1.436	0.434	
						0.870	0.280	2.701	0.810	
Week of 1st ANC						1.001	0.979	1.023	0.956	
Supplement Any						0.695	0.505	0.955	0.025	**
Moderate Exercise Freq.						0.875	0.787	0.972	0.013	***

**TABLE 4.3 (Continued)**

<b>Care Seeking</b>	1.015	0.678	1.517	0.944		1.021	0.681	1.530	0.920	
<b>Home</b>										
<b>Practice</b>	0.919	0.608	1.389	0.687		0.920	0.607	1.394	0.694	
<b>All Texts</b>	0.754	0.499	1.139	0.180		0.726	0.478	1.102	0.132	
<b>Attitude</b>	0.925	0.779	1.098	0.373						
<b>Expectations</b>	0.980	0.769	1.249	0.870						
<b>Attitude</b>	0.925	0.779	1.098	0.373		0.923	0.774	1.100	0.370	
<b>Expectations</b>	0.980	0.769	1.249	0.870		0.976	0.765	1.246	0.848	
<b>Self Efficacy</b>	1.004	0.832	1.212	0.969		1.006	0.833	1.214	0.953	
<b>Personal</b>										
<b>Pressure</b>	0.940	0.813	1.088	0.407		0.933	0.805	1.081	0.356	
<b>Intentions</b>	0.885	0.738	1.061	0.188		0.884	0.735	1.063	0.189	
<b>Plans</b>	1.133	0.951	1.349	0.162		1.126	0.944	1.342	0.186	
<b>Susceptible- Severity Category</b>										
<b>2</b>	0.518	0.284	0.945	0.032	**	0.523	0.286	0.957	0.035	**
<b>3</b>	0.784	0.414	1.483	0.454		0.812	0.427	1.543	0.524	
<b>4</b>	0.493	0.268	0.906	0.023	**	0.514	0.279	0.948	0.033	**
<b>5</b>	0.751	0.437	1.289	0.299		0.765	0.442	1.322	0.337	
<b>6</b>	0.906	0.403	2.034	0.811		0.900	0.399	2.031	0.799	
<b>7</b>	1.434	0.827	2.484	0.199		1.483	0.853	2.580	0.163	
<b>8</b>	1.063	0.443	2.554	0.891		1.103	0.456	2.665	0.828	
<b>9</b>	1.144	0.724	1.807	0.565		1.184	0.746	1.881	0.473	
<b>Social Norm: % Women, none omitted</b>										
<b>Some</b>	0.417	0.091	1.899	0.258		0.437	0.096	1.991	0.285	
<b>About Half</b>	0.510	0.114	2.275	0.377		0.518	0.116	2.318	0.389	
<b>Most</b>	0.561	0.135	2.333	0.427		0.555	0.133	2.319	0.420	
<b>Almost All</b>	0.638	0.143	2.846	0.556		0.641	0.143	2.879	0.561	
<b>Don't know</b>	0.664	0.157	2.805	0.577		0.655	0.154	2.786	0.566	
<b>Education: Jr. High - Omitted</b>										
<b>Sr. High</b>	1.205	0.828	1.754	0.331		1.208	0.825	1.769	0.331	
<b>3 Yr. College</b>	0.918	0.547	1.541	0.747		0.957	0.566	1.616	0.868	
<b>4 Yr. College</b>										
<b>+</b>	1.226	0.549	2.740	0.619		1.292	0.574	2.908	0.536	
<b>Husband Education</b>										
<b>Sr. High</b>	0.738	0.503	1.084	0.121		0.736	0.499	1.086	0.123	
<b>3 Yr. College</b>	1.224	0.751	1.995	0.416		1.139	0.692	1.876	0.608	
<b>4 Yr. College</b>										
<b>+</b>	0.516	0.227	1.172	0.114		0.490	0.214	1.121	0.091	*

**TABLE 4.3 (Continued)**

<b>Income ≤22000 omitted</b>									
<b>&gt; 22,000 RMB</b>	1.078	0.662	1.755	0.763		1.084	0.668	1.761	0.744
<b>&gt; 40,001 RMB</b>	1.196	0.700	2.043	0.512		1.166	0.678	2.005	0.579
<b>&gt; 65,001 RMB</b>	1.286	0.762	2.170	0.346		1.288	0.762	2.176	0.345
<b>Age (Centered)</b>	0.990	0.943	1.040	0.695		0.994	0.946	1.045	0.817
<b>Un-Planned Pregnancy</b>	0.752	0.537	1.052	0.096	*	0.734	0.522	1.032	0.075 *
<b>Prev. Live Birth</b>	0.841	0.556	1.272	0.412		0.825	0.543	1.253	0.367
<b>Past Miscarriage</b>	0.659	0.474	0.917	0.013	**	0.631	0.452	0.880	0.007 ***
<b>Weight (Centered)</b>	0.985	0.976	0.994	0.002	***	0.984	0.975	0.994	0.001 ***
<b>Province / City</b>	1.188	0.470	3.003	0.716		1.230	0.481	3.146	0.665
<b>County</b>	0.783	0.436	1.405	0.412		0.760	0.422	1.367	0.360
<b>Township</b>	0.967	0.652	1.434	0.868		0.999	0.672	1.486	0.997
<b>Insurance - NCRMS omitted</b>									
<b>Urban Worker</b>	0.966	0.402	2.325	0.939		0.921	0.378	2.247	0.857
<b>Other</b>	1.366	0.813	2.296	0.239		1.371	0.815	2.308	0.234
<b>None</b>	0.875	0.277	2.761	0.820		0.886	0.281	2.794	0.836
<b>No Answer</b>	0.666	0.281	1.580	0.357		0.686	0.287	1.637	0.396
<b>Health before Preg.: Very good Omitted</b>									
<b>Good</b>	1.189	0.660	2.140	0.565		1.171	0.648	2.114	0.601
<b>Fair</b>	1.250	0.682	2.291	0.471		1.249	0.677	2.303	0.476
<b>Poor</b>	1.433	0.441	4.655	0.549		1.503	0.458	4.929	0.502
<b>Health Better</b>	0.876	0.405	1.899	0.738		0.855	0.394	1.857	0.692
<b>Health Worse</b>	0.775	0.513	1.171	0.227		0.737	0.485	1.120	0.153
<b>Health Not Sure</b>	1.173	0.742	1.855	0.495		1.218	0.767	1.935	0.404
<b>Drinker (Baseline)</b>	1.420	0.517	3.902	0.496		1.427	0.519	3.918	0.491
<b>Husband Never Smoke</b>	0.921	0.666	1.274	0.621		0.912	0.658	1.265	0.582
<b>Husband Former Smoke</b>	0.684	0.345	1.355	0.276		0.674	0.337	1.348	0.265
<b>Constant</b>	0.926	0.135	6.348	0.938		1.940	0.249	15.112	0.527

\* p < .10

\*\* p < .05

\*\*\* p < .01

The results of this regression show that when included in multivariable regression, two of the five proposed health behaviors (namely, supplementing nutrients and moderate exercise) are significantly associated with SGA in their expected direction. Seeking care during illness, which would be expected to have a protective effect, is measured to be associated with reduced odds of SGA, but this association is not significant. Interestingly, smoking during pregnancy shows no deleterious association with SGA, and is even measured as slightly protective. This result is likely to do with an extremely small number of women reporting smoking during pregnancy in our sample. Only 32 women (1.7%) were self reported smokers; but the adjusted model has well over 32 continuous or categorical indicator regressors, and as such is unlikely to be estimating the effect of smoking with adequate statistical power. Finally, timing of ANC initiation was found to have no relation to SGA in this population.

It should be noted that simultaneously testing the association of 5 behaviors with SGA warrants a correction for testing multiple hypotheses. Using a Holm-Bonferroni correction for 5 tests and a one tailed test for the literature indicated benefits of supplemental nutrition and moderate exercise on SGA, the most significant should have  $p \leq 2 \cdot .05/5$ ; i.e., .02, and conditional on meeting this standard, the second most significant should have  $p \leq 2 \cdot .05/4 = .025$ . These criteria are met, and therefore these associations remain significant after adjusting for multiple hypothesis testing.

These results indicate two tested behaviors meet Baron and Kenny's third mediation criterion: that the mediator affects the dependent variable in the expected direction while controlling for the independent variable. Moreover, these regression results also meet the fourth criterion, that

the independent variable's measured effect on the dependent variable while controlling for the mediator is less than when not controlling for the mediator. Without controlling for behaviors, high family support is associated with an odds ratio of 0.681, ( $p=.013$ ). Controlling for behaviors attenuates this odds ratio to 0.772, and the  $p$ -value changes to a non-significant 0.122.

This set of findings prompts the final test of mediation, regressing the two behaviors significantly predictive of SGA on family support. Having failed to meet Baron and Kenny's third criterion for mediation, we exclude the other three behaviors as possible mediators, and it is not necessary to perform further mediation analysis on them.

Table 4.2 shows the unadjusted odds ratios for each health behavior comparing women with a high self-reported level of family support compared to the odds for women with low levels of family support. These odds ratios are the exponentiated coefficients of logistic regression of each behavior on high family support. The exception is the odds ratio from the Moderate Exercise Frequency regression, which is the exponentiated coefficient from ordered logistic regression. Unadjusted results are presented in Table 4.4 below, and the fully adjusted regressions are presented in Table 4.5.

**TABLE 4.4: Unadjusted Logistic Regressions: Prenatal Behaviors On High Family Support**

BEHAVIOR	ODDS RATIO	P-VALUE
Supplements Any <sup>a</sup>	1.451 (95% CI 1.188 - 1.771)	0.0003 ***
Moderate Exercise Frequency <sup>b</sup>	3.689 (95% CI 3.097 – 4.394)	<0.0001 ***

a: Self reports supplementing any of calcium, iron, or protein powder during pregnancy

b: 5 category ordered logit



**TABLE 4.5: Adjusted Logistic Regressions: Prenatal Behaviors On High Family Support**

	Any Supplements					Moderate Exercise Frequency				
	Odds Ratio	P Value	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI		Odds Ratio	P Value	Low 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	
<b>Family Support</b>	1.415	0.001	1.147	1.746	***	3.825	0.000	3.194	4.581	***
<b>Any Illness</b>	2.256	0.000	1.765	2.883	***	0.915	0.340	0.762	1.098	
<b>Care Seeking Group</b>	0.913	0.539	0.683	1.221		0.906	0.420	0.712	1.152	
<b>GHPP Group</b>	0.890	0.439	0.663	1.195		0.972	0.822	0.762	1.241	
<b>All Texts Group</b>	0.974	0.856	0.732	1.295		0.807	0.071	0.639	1.018	*
<b>Baseline Health:</b>										
<b>Attitude</b>	1.054	0.425	0.926	1.199		0.950	0.336	0.857	1.054	
<b>Expectations</b>	1.012	0.896	0.848	1.207		0.970	0.665	0.843	1.115	
<b>Self Efficacy</b>	1.088	0.185	0.961	1.232		1.016	0.756	0.921	1.120	
<b>Personal Pressure</b>	0.975	0.634	0.878	1.082		0.990	0.816	0.910	1.077	
<b>Intentions</b>	0.953	0.453	0.840	1.081		1.062	0.265	0.955	1.181	
<b>Plans</b>	0.927	0.214	0.823	1.045		0.954	0.357	0.863	1.055	
<b>Susceptible-Severity Category</b>										
<b>2</b>	1.060	0.763	0.726	1.547		0.885	0.424	0.657	1.194	
<b>3</b>	0.931	0.763	0.585	1.482		1.066	0.743	0.729	1.557	
<b>4</b>	1.094	0.646	0.746	1.603		1.141	0.406	0.836	1.557	
<b>5</b>	0.814	0.275	0.562	1.178		1.111	0.514	0.809	1.526	
<b>6</b>	0.969	0.912	0.550	1.705		0.713	0.153	0.448	1.134	
<b>7</b>	0.791	0.289	0.514	1.219		1.178	0.369	0.824	1.682	
<b>8</b>	1.476	0.276	0.732	2.974		1.020	0.944	0.596	1.746	
<b>9</b>	0.978	0.898	0.695	1.377		1.073	0.625	0.809	1.424	
<b>Social Norm: % Women, none omitted</b>										
<b>Some</b>	1.066	0.916	0.329	3.456		1.216	0.690	0.465	3.182	
<b>About Half</b>	1.132	0.840	0.342	3.746		1.042	0.932	0.404	2.690	
<b>Most</b>	0.933	0.905	0.299	2.911		0.935	0.887	0.370	2.364	
<b>Almost All</b>	1.011	0.985	0.310	3.297		1.081	0.877	0.404	2.892	
<b>Don't know</b>	0.880	0.828	0.278	2.787		1.056	0.908	0.417	2.676	
<b>Education: Jr. High - Omitted</b>										
<b>Sr. High</b>	1.238	0.108	0.954	1.606		0.877	0.240	0.705	1.092	
<b>3 Yr. College</b>	1.649	0.007	1.146	2.372	***	0.934	0.646	0.697	1.252	
<b>4 Yr. College +</b>	1.298	0.390	0.716	2.356		1.079	0.753	0.672	1.732	

**TABLE 4.5 (Continued)**

<b>Husband Education</b>									
<b>Sr. High</b>	0.853	0.230	0.658	1.106		1.171	0.154	0.942	1.455
<b>3 Yr. College</b>	0.861	0.418	0.599	1.237		0.984	0.915	0.733	1.321
<b>4 Yr. College + Income &lt;=22000 omitted</b>	1.365	0.286	0.771	2.417		0.764	0.206	0.504	1.159
<b>&gt; 22,001 RMB</b>	1.236	0.249	0.862	1.773		0.973	0.838	0.751	1.262
<b>&gt; 40,001 RMB</b>	1.403	0.048	1.002	1.964		0.975	0.882	0.699	1.360
<b>&gt; 65,001 RMB</b>	1.497	0.035	1.029	2.177	**	0.856	0.336	0.624	1.174
<b>Age (Centered)</b>	0.996	0.811	0.964	1.029		1.010	0.485	0.982	1.038
<b>Un-Planned Pregnancy</b>	0.907	0.416	0.717	1.147		1.077	0.440	0.891	1.303
<b>Prev. Live Birth</b>	0.888	0.404	0.672	1.174		1.137	0.290	0.897	1.441
<b>Past Miscarriage</b>	1.094	0.428	0.875	1.368		0.858	0.098	0.715	1.029 *
<b>Weight (Centered)</b>	0.992	0.014	0.986	0.998	**	1.001	0.618	0.996	1.007
<b>Province / City</b>	1.495	0.304	0.694	3.217		1.144	0.632	0.660	1.983
<b>County</b>	1.104	0.616	0.750	1.624		0.805	0.157	0.596	1.087
<b>Township</b>	1.456	0.010	1.095	1.935		1.147	0.246	0.910	1.445
<b>Insurance - NCMS omitted</b>									
<b>Urban Worker</b>	0.564	0.071	0.303	1.051	*	1.035	0.894	0.622	1.723
<b>Urban Resident</b>	1.038	0.857	0.690	1.562		1.049	0.773	0.759	1.448
<b>Other</b>	0.844	0.634	0.419	1.698		1.020	0.948	0.570	1.824
<b>None</b>	1.013	0.961	0.604	1.698		0.798	0.276	0.532	1.197
<b>Health before Preg.: Very good Omitted</b>									
<b>Good</b>	0.828	0.357	0.553	1.238		0.969	0.8474	0.705	1.332
<b>Fair</b>	0.825	0.359	0.548	1.244		0.921	0.629	0.660	1.286
<b>Poor</b>	0.691	0.363	0.311	1.534		1.072	0.842	0.540	2.127
<b>Health Better</b>	0.958	0.871	0.573	1.601		0.808	0.302	0.539	1.211
<b>Health Worse</b>	0.881	0.373	0.666	1.165		0.871	0.236	0.693	1.095
<b>Health Not Sure</b>	1.185	0.350	0.830	1.690		0.970	0.830	0.738	1.277
<b>Drinker (Baseline)</b>	0.777	0.520	0.361	1.673		1.267	0.495	0.643	2.495
<b>Husband Never Smoke</b>	0.998	0.984	0.797	1.248		0.100	0.996	0.829	1.206

**TABLE 4.5 (Continued)**

<b>Husband</b>									
<b>Former Smoke</b>	0.974	0.906	0.623	1.522	1.064	0.742	0.734	1.543	
Constant	1.463	0.626	0.316	6.766					
Cut 1					0.230	0.016	0.069	0.764	
Cut 2					0.467	0.213	0.141	1.546	
Cut 3					1.003	0.996	0.303	3.317	
Cut 4					2.441	0.144	0.737	8.081	

a: Self reports supplementing any of calcium, iron, or protein powder during pregnancy

b: 5 category ordered logit

Tables 4.4 and 4.5 show that a high level of family support has a strong, positive association with both nutrition supplementation and moderate exercise frequency. These results are not only highly statistically significant, but the measured odds ratios are quite large. These findings indicate that Baron and Kenny's 1<sup>st</sup> criterion for mediation is met; the independent variable (high family support) is associated with the behavioral mediators in the expected direction; namely that of better nutrition and more exercise.

## DISCUSSION

In total, 220 (11.4%) of newborns in our sample fit this criterion for SGA, whereas 1,710 (88.6%) did not. This is near to, but slightly higher than, the 10% that would be expected for China as a whole under the formula created by Mikolajczyk et al. which was used in this study to generate our reference standard for China's national weight for age distribution. The definition of SGA is meant to encompass the lowest decile of weight for gestational age, and it may be that newborn weight in Xi'an is slightly lower than China's national average and variance that was input into Mikolajczyk et al.'s formula would predict. High family support was found to be associated with significantly reduced odds of SGA, OR=0.681, (p=.013). Given that 63.7% of

respondents experience high levels of support, assuming this odds ratio of 0.681 is causal would imply that family support experienced by the sample respondents is responsible for a decline in SGA of 2.5 percentage points, from an expected 13.9% in the absence of high family support for any respondent. However, as this analysis is observational, and family support was not experimentally randomized, we cannot infer with confidence whether this association is in fact causal.

The regression analyses presented above show that the hypothesized behavioral pathway between family support and lowered odds of SGA meets the four conditions for establishing mediation. Specifically, it shows that the measured association between family support and reduced odds of SGA seems at least partially mediated by family support's association with increased nutrition and increased moderate exercise frequency during pregnancy. This lends support to the school of thought which models the effect of social support on health as being mediated by changes in health behavior. However, the measured association of high family support with SGA does not go to zero, implying that nutritional supplementation and exercise frequency alone may not perfectly mediate the association. The remaining association may be mediated by other behaviors not considered or by a “buffering” or “direct” effect of social support on SGA, or a combination of these possibilities. As the remaining association is no longer statistically significant, we also cannot rule out that there is no association left to mediate and that the remaining measured association is due to stochastic error. Whatever the full pathway, higher levels of family support are associated with reduced odds of being born small for gestational age in our study population.

Taken together, the results of this paper suggest that family support may be an overall benefit to the health behaviors of pregnant women in the context of Xi'an China, and benefit the health of their children as measured by the odds of being born small for gestational age. However, causal inference is precluded by the observational nature of the study. Nonetheless, the association is sufficiently promising to warrant further study in experimental settings. It may be that interventions aimed at altering pregnancy related behaviors in China could benefit from including an attempt to muster the support of the pregnant women's family and experimental research should determine if this is the case. As mentioned earlier in this paper, there has been disconnect thus far between the very promising observational findings regarding social support and health outcomes and the disappointing results of intervention trials attempting to promote better health outcomes by attempting to promote social support. Some evidence suggests that such interventions do better when targeting women based on low existing social support than when targeting based on other criteria, such as medical risk factors for low birth weight (Orr, 2004). Numerous authors on the subject have called for strategies to better involve partners and families in antenatal care and pregnancy behaviors (Aaronson, 1989; Abdollahpour et al., 2015; Aguiar and Jennings, 2015; Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Orr, 2004). How to do so efficiently and effectively is not currently clear, though targeting women with low social support seems to be a good start. Creative and rigorously evaluated intervention studies on leveraging family support might be of great benefit if consistently successful strategies are uncovered and a causal association between family support and newborn health exists.

## STRENGTHS & LIMITATIONS

This is the first paper of its kind to investigate the association of familial support, pregnancy health behaviors, and SGA in China. The measured associations with health behaviors and the health outcome of SGA are large enough to be clinically significant, and they are robust to the inclusion of a wide array of control variables. Further, the statistical significance of the associations nutrition supplementation and more moderate exercise with family support as well as with reduced odds of SGA are strong enough to easily remain statistically significant even with a Holm-Bonferroni correction for testing the potential mediation of five behaviors.

However, our inference is limited by the observational nature of the study. Because family support levels were not exogenously influenced, we cannot say with any confidence that family support *causes* either different health behaviors or reduced rates of SGA births, though our data is consistent with this possibility. Despite the array of control variables included in the adjusted regressions, there may be omitted ones not measured that are inducing the association. We are also equally unable to rule out reverse causation; the possibility that better health behaviors during pregnancy are rewarded by or otherwise inspire increased levels of family support. It may also be the case that mothers with better birth outcomes look back more fondly on their pregnancy and more willingly categorize their families as highly supportive in the past months.

A related limiting factor is that we only have a self-reported measure of familial support. Of itself this is no failing and is actually in line with the most literature on social support; *perceived* social support is more commonly investigated than *received* social support (Gallant, 2003; Nurullah, 2012). However, inclusion of an objective measure of *received* social support would

allow a complementary investigation with potentially confirmatory or distinct results. Similarly, “family” is subjectively defined by each respondent and treated as a single unit; this study sheds no specific light on which family members (for example, spouses or mothers-in-law) are most influential, or whether this varies across families.

Similarly, all behavioral measures are self-reported rather than objectively measured. Self-reported behavioral measures can be subject to social acceptability bias when respondents want to give the “right” answer to surveyors. Rates of “good” behavior are likely to be overestimated in our study. This bias does not particularly harm the inferences made above if the propensity to exaggerate “good” behaviors is distributed equally between women with both high and low levels of family support. However, if there is a connection wherein women with high levels of family support feel more inclined to give investigator pleasing responses, or wherein women who exaggerated their “right” answers were also more inclined to exaggerate their level of perceived family support, the estimated associations above will be upwardly biased and overstated. However, the fact that the one objectively measured behavior, the number of ANC checkups attended, has an association with family support of similar magnitude and significance as the other behaviors suggests that this potential bias is not a decisive issue.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

A high level of family support is associated with reduced odds of being born small for gestational age in our study population from Xi’an, china. Evidence suggests that this protective association seems partially, though not fully, mediated through improved nutrient intake and

improved moderate exercise frequency that are also associated with a high level of family support during pregnancy. These findings suggest that research is warranted on how maternal health professionals can effectively and efficiently induce supportive familial involvement in pregnancies where women feel a lack of social support.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaronson, L.S., 1989. Perceived and received support: effects on health behavior during pregnancy. *Nurs. Res.* 38, 4–9.
- Abdollahpour, S., Ramezani, S., Khosravi, A., 2015. Perceived Social Support among Family in Pregnant Women. *Int. J. Pediatr.* 3, 879–888.
- Aguiar, C., Jennings, L., 2015. Impact of Male Partner Antenatal Accompaniment on Perinatal Health Outcomes in Developing Countries: A Systematic Literature Review. *Matern. Child Health J.* 19, 2012–2019. doi:10.1007/s10995-015-1713-2
- Allendorf, K., 2010. The Quality of Family Relationships and Use of Maternal Health-care Services in India. *Stud. Fam. Plann.* 41, 263–276.
- Allgöwer, A., Wardle, J., Steptoe, A., 2001. Depressive symptoms, social support, and personal health behaviors in young men and women. *Health Psychol.* 20, 223.
- Baron, R.M., Kenny, D.A., 1986. The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 51, 1173.
- Beattie, M.C., 2001. Meta-Analysis of social relationships and posttreatment drinking outcomes: comparison of relationship structure, function and quality. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 62, 518–527.
- Cannella, B.L., 2006. Mediators of the relationship between social support and positive health practices in pregnant women. *Nurs. Res.* 55, 437–445.
- Carron, A.V., Hausenblas, H.A., Mack, D.E., 2010. Social Influence and Exercise: A Meta-Analysis. *JSEP* 18.
- Chen, C.-M., Kuo, S.-F., Chou, Y.-H., Chen, H.-C., 2007. Postpartum Taiwanese women: their postpartum depression, social support and health-promoting lifestyle profiles. *J. Clin. Nurs.* 16, 1550–1560.
- CHEN, X.-K., Wen, S.W., Yang, Q., Walker, M.C., 2007. Adequacy of prenatal care and neonatal mortality in infants born to mothers with and without antenatal high-risk conditions. *Aust. N. Z. J. Obstet. Gynaecol.* 47, 122–127.
- de Jersey, S.J., 2013. Are we missing opportunities? Understanding health behaviours associated with overweight in pregnancy.
- DiMatteo, M.R., 2004. Social support and patient adherence to medical treatment: a meta-analysis. *Health Psychol.* 23, 207.
- Dunkel Schetter, C., 2011. Psychological science on pregnancy: stress processes, biopsychosocial models, and emerging research issues. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 62, 531–558.



- Feldman, P.J., Dunkel-Schetter, C., Sandman, C.A., Wadhwa, P.D., 2000. Maternal social support predicts birth weight and fetal growth in human pregnancy. *Psychosom. Med.* 62, 715–725.
- Fernández, L.E., Newby, A., 2010. Family Support and Pregnancy Behavior among Women in Two Border Mexican Cities. *Front. Norte* 22, 7–34.
- Fowles, E.R., Fowles, S.L., 2008. Healthy eating during pregnancy: determinants and supportive strategies. *J. Community Health Nurs.* 25, 138–152.
- Gallant, M.P., 2003. The influence of social support on chronic illness self-management: a review and directions for research. *Health Educ. Behav.* 30, 170–195.
- Harley, K., Eskenazi, B., 2006. Time in the United States, social support and health behaviors during pregnancy among women of Mexican descent. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 62, 3048–3061.
- Hohmann-Marriott, B., 2009. The couple context of pregnancy and its effects on prenatal care and birth outcomes. *Matern. Child Health J.* 13, 745–754.
- Hopkins, S.A., Cutfield, W.S., 2011. Exercise in pregnancy: weighing up the long-term impact on the next generation. *Exerc. Sport Sci. Rev.* 39, 120–127.
- Hu, H.H., Li, G., Arao, T., 2015. The association of family social support, depression, anxiety and self-efficacy with specific hypertension self-care behaviours in Chinese local community. *J. Hum. Hypertens.* 29, 198–203.
- Katz, J., Lee, A.C., Kozuki, N., Lawn, J.E., Cousens, S., Blencowe, H., Ezzati, M., Bhutta, Z.A., Marchant, T., Willey, B.A., others, 2013. Mortality risk in preterm and small-for-gestational-age infants in low-income and middle-income countries: a pooled country analysis. *The Lancet* 382, 417–425.
- Kimbrow, R.T., 2008. Together forever? Romantic relationship characteristics and prenatal health behaviors. *J. Marriage Fam.* 70, 745–757.
- King, G., Honaker, J., Joseph, A., Scheve, K., 2001. Analyzing incomplete political science data: An alternative algorithm for multiple imputation, in: *American Political Science Association*. Cambridge Univ Press, pp. 49–69.
- Kratz, L.M., Wong, Y.J., Vaughan, E.L., 2013. Health behaviors among pregnant women: The influence of social support. *Soc. Support Theory Role Gend. Cult. Health* 109–122.
- Leal, M. do C., Pereira, A.P.E., Lamarca, G. de A., Vettore, M.V., 2011. The relationship between social capital, social support and the adequate use of prenatal care. *Cad. Saúde Pública* 27, s237–s253.
- Lee, A.C., Katz, J., Blencowe, H., Cousens, S., Kozuki, N., Vogel, J.P., Adair, L., Baqui, A.H., Bhutta, Z.A., Caulfield, L.E., others, 2013. National and regional estimates of term and preterm babies born small for gestational age in 138 low-income and middle-income countries in 2010. *Lancet Glob. Health* 1, e26–e36.
- Lin, Y.-H., Tsai, E.-M., Chan, T.-F., Chou, F.-H., Lin, Y.-L., 2009. Health promoting lifestyles and related factors in pregnant women. *Chang Gung Med J* 32, 650–61.
- Lippke, S., Ziegelmann, J.P., 2008. Theory-Based Health Behavior Change: Developing, Testing, and Applying Theories for Evidence-Based Interventions. *Appl. Psychol. Int. Rev.* 57, 698–716.
- Martin, L.T., McNamara, M.J., Milot, A.S., Halle, T., Hair, E.C., 2007. The effects of father involvement during pregnancy on receipt of prenatal care and maternal smoking. *Matern. Child Health J.* 11, 595–602.

- Mikolajczyk, R.T., Zhang, J., Betran, A.P., Souza, J.P., Mori, R., Gülmezoglu, A.M., Meriäldi, M., 2011. A global reference for fetal-weight and birthweight percentiles. *The Lancet* 377, 1855–1861.
- Mullany, B.C., Becker, S., Hindin, M.J., 2007. The impact of including husbands in antenatal health education services on maternal health practices in urban Nepal: results from a randomized controlled trial. *Health Educ. Res.* 22, 166–176.
- Nash, D.M., Gilliland, J.A., Evers, S.E., Wilk, P., Campbell, M.K., 2013. Determinants of Diet Quality in Pregnancy: Sociodemographic, Pregnancy-specific, and Food Environment Influences. *J. Nutr. Educ. Behav.* 45, 627–634. doi:10.1016/j.jneb.2013.04.268
- National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2016. China's Economy Realized a Moderate but Stable and Sound Growth in 2015 [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.stats.gov.cn/english/PressRelease/201601/t20160119\\_1306072.html](http://www.stats.gov.cn/english/PressRelease/201601/t20160119_1306072.html) (accessed 3.7.16).
- Noar, S.M., Zimmerman, R.S., 2005. Health Behavior Theory and cumulative knowledge regarding health behaviors: are we moving in the right direction? *Health Educ. Res.* 20, 275–290.
- Nurullah, A.S., 2012. Received and provided social support: A review of current evidence and future directions. *Am. J. Health Stud.* 27, 173–188.
- Onat, G., Aba, Y.A., 2014. Health-promoting lifestyles and related factors among pregnant women. *Turk. J. Public Health* 12, 69.
- Orr, S.T., 2004. Social support and pregnancy outcome: a review of the literature. *Clin. Obstet. Gynecol.* 47, 842–855.
- Park, C.L., Gaffey, A.E., 2007. Relationships between psychosocial factors and health behavior change in cancer survivors: an integrative review. *Ann. Behav. Med.* 34, 115–134.
- Patra, J., Bakker, R., Irving, H., Jaddoe, V.W., Malini, S., Rehm, J., 2011. Dose–response relationship between alcohol consumption before and during pregnancy and the risks of low birthweight, preterm birth and small for gestational age (SGA)—a systematic review and meta-analyses. *BJOG Int. J. Obstet. Gynaecol.* 118, 1411–1421.
- Rosland, A.-M., Piette, J.D., 2010. Emerging models for mobilizing family support for chronic disease management: a structured review. *Chronic Illn.* 6, 7–21.
- Shor, E., Roelfs, D.J., Yogeve, T., 2013. The strength of family ties: A meta-analysis and meta-regression of self-reported social support and mortality. *Soc. Netw.* 35, 626–638.
- Siebel, A.L., Carey, A.L., Kingwell, B.A., 2012. Can exercise training rescue the adverse cardiometabolic effects of low birth weight and prematurity? *Clin. Exp. Pharmacol. Physiol.* 39, 944–957.
- Stephens, C.J., 1985. Perception of pregnancy and social support as predictors of alcohol consumption during pregnancy. *Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res.* 9, 344–348.
- Taylor, S.E., Welch, W.T., Kim, H.S., Sherman, D.K., 2007. Cultural differences in the impact of social support on psychological and biological stress responses. *Psychol. Sci.* 18, 831–837.
- Tay, L., Tan, K., Diener, E., Gonzalez, E., 2013. Social relations, health behaviors, and health outcomes: A survey and synthesis. *Appl. Psychol. Health Well-Being* 5, 28–78.
- VanderWeele, T.J., Lantos, J.D., Siddique, J., Lauderdale, D.S., 2009. A comparison of four prenatal care indices in birth outcome models: comparable results for predicting small-for-gestational-age outcome but different results for preterm birth or infant mortality. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* 62, 438–445.

- Vardavas, C.I., Chatzi, L., Patelarou, E., Plana, E., Sarri, K., Kafatos, A., Koutis, A.D., Kogevinas, M., 2010. Smoking and smoking cessation during early pregnancy and its effect on adverse pregnancy outcomes and fetal growth. *Eur. J. Pediatr.* 169, 741–748.
- Wiebe, H.W., Boulé, N.G., Chari, R., Davenport, M.H., 2015. The effect of supervised prenatal exercise on fetal growth: a meta-analysis. *Obstet. Gynecol.* 125, 1185–1194.
- Yargawa, J., Leonardi-Bee, J., 2015. Male involvement and maternal health outcomes: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 69, 604–612.

#### **APPENDIX 4.1: Formulation and Implementation of Mikolajczyk et al.'s SGA Cutoff**

To create a globally adaptable reference population, Mikolajczyk et al. begin with Hadlock et al.'s (1991) formula, where GA is gestational age in exact weeks:

$$\text{Eq. 1) Fetal weight (g)} = \exp(0.578 + 0.332 \times \text{GA} - 0.00354 \times \text{GA}^2)$$

Note that if measured in full week increments rather than exact weeks, as in our study, 0.5 should be added to birth week. As discussed in Mikolajczyk et al.'s study, this original reference was based on 392 pregnant women within the USA, and it was noted by Hadlock and colleagues that variation in fetal weight given gestational week was a constant fraction of the mean. This prompted Gardosi et al. (1995) to expand the Hadlock formula by creating an individualized reference by adjusting for ethnic group and other maternal demographics, with fixed means and standard deviations based on these adjustments.

Mikolajczyk et al. expand Gardosi et al.'s framework by assuming that the mean birth weight at 40 weeks could vary by country, and that percentiles of birth weights by gestational age could be extrapolated from means and standard deviations of birth weights by assuming a normal distribution. In their equation, mean birth weight at 40 weeks for the country is divided by the constant of 3705g, the mean birth weight at 40.5 weeks in Hadlock's equation. This ratio was assumed constant across gestational week, and was used as a constant multiplier for on Hadlock's formula for mean gestational weight estimates. In Mikolajczyk et al.'s study, China had a mean birth weight of 3410g. Thus, Mikolajczyk et al.'s formula applied to China becomes

$$\text{Eq. 2) Expected Mean Fetal Weight (g)} = (3410/3705) \times \exp(0.578 + 0.332 \times \text{GA} - 0.00354 \times \text{GA}^2)$$

As in Hadlock's et al.'s findings, standard deviations in birth weight were assumed to be a constant portion of mean birth weight. This proportion is found by dividing the measured mean and measured standard deviation of birth weight at 40 weeks within a population. In China, Mikolajczyk et al. found the standard deviation to be 411g. Thus at any gestational age in China, the standard deviation (SD) of birth weight is expected to be:

$$\text{Eq. 3) SD} = (411/3410) \times \text{Expected Mean Fetal Weight}$$

Small for gestational age (SGA) is defined to be falling in the bottom 10 percent of birth weights for birth at that gestational week. Assuming a normal distribution of fetal weight at a given gestational age, the fetal weight of the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile is equal to the mean weight minus 1.281551 standard deviations in weight. Operationalized for our study, this defines an SGA cutoff of:

$$\text{Eq. 4) Birth Weight} < (1 - 1.281551 \times (411/3410)) \times (3410/3705) \times \exp(0.578 + 0.332 \times \text{GA} - 0.00354 \times \text{GA}^2)$$

Where GA denotes recorded birth week plus 0.5.

#### APPENDIX 4.2 : Range and N of All Regression Variables

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Possible Responses or Range</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Age</b>	18-45 yrs	1,951
<b>Height</b>	140-198 cm	1,946
<b>Weight right before pregnancy</b>	77 - 174 lbs	1,927
<b>Residency</b>	Province/City, County, Township, Village	1,902
<b>Occupation</b>	Farmer, Private Business Owner, Government Worker, Migrant Worker, Local Worker, Home-Maker, Other	1,889
<b>Education</b>	Jr. High or less, Sr. High / technical school, 3 Yr. College, 4yr college or more	1,922
<b>Own Phone</b>	Self, Family, Others	1,917
<b>Husband Education</b>	Jr. High or less, Sr. High / technical school, 3 Yr. College, 4yr college or more	1,923
<b>Insurance</b>	NCMS, Urban Worker, Government Worker, Other, None	1,807
<b>Married</b>	Married, Not (Single / Divorced / Widowed)	1,923
<b>Household Members</b>	1-9 people	1,920
<b>Family Income</b>	1,000 - 1,000,000	1,017
<b>Pregnancy #</b>	1, 2, 3+	1,933
<b>PreviousLive Births</b>	0, 1, 2+	1,886
<b>Previous Miscarriages</b>	0, 1, 2+	1,887
<b>Health Condition Before Pregnancy</b>	Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor	1,874
<b>Health Compared to Before</b>	Better, The Same, Worse, Don't Know	1,857
<b>Smoker</b>	Yes, No	1,893
<b>Husband Smoke</b>	Yes, No, Former	1,897
<b>Drinker</b>	Yes, No	1,890
<b>Husband Drink</b>	Yes, No, Former	1,886
<b>Exerciser</b>	Yes, No, Former	1,883
<b>Husband Exercise</b>	Yes, No, Former	1,869
<b>Pregnancy Week</b>	1 - 42	1,816
<b>Pregnancy Planned</b>	Yes, No	1,861
<b>Singleton</b>	Yes, No, Don't Know	1,837
<b>Health Attitudes</b>		1,870
<b>Health Expectations</b>	Likert Scale: 1-5	1,779
<b>Health Self-Efficacy</b>	Likert Scale: 1-5	1,754
<b>Health Personal Norms</b>	Likert Scale: 1-5	1,813
<b>Health Intentions</b>	Likert Scale: 1-5	1,813
<b>Health Plans</b>	Likert Scale: 1-5	1,922
<b>Health Susceptibility</b>	Likert Scale: 1-5, Don't Know	1,884
<b>Health Severity</b>	Likert Scale: 1-5, Don't Know	1,818
<b>Health Social Norms</b>	Likert Scale: 1-5	1,521

#### APPENDIX 4.2 (Continued)

<b>Family Gender Preference</b>	Boy, Girl, No Preference	1,880
<b>Mother Gender Preference</b>	Boy, Girl, No Preference	1,875
<b>Delivery Preference</b>	Vaginal, Caesarean Section, No Preference	1,924
<b>Family Support</b>	High, Low	1,898
<b>Birth Weight of Newborn</b>	1.6 - 10.0 lbs	1,948
<b>Gestational Age at Delivery</b>	28 - 43 weeks	1,932
<b>Delivery Mode</b>	Vaginal, Caesarean	1,936
<b>Smoking during Pregnancy</b>	Yes, No	1,927
<b>Ill</b>	Yes, No	1,906
<b>Sought Care</b>	Yes, No	1,802
<b>Moderate Exercise Frequency</b>	Never", "<1x/m", "1-3x/m", "1-4x/wk", and ">=4x/wk"	1,920
<b>Supplemented Calcium</b>	Yes, No	1,941
<b>Supplemented Iron</b>	Yes, No	1,936
<b>Supplemented Protein Powder</b>	Yes, No	1,923
<b>Supplemented Folic Acid</b>	Yes, No	1,943